

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SEPTEMBER, 1842.

A Treatise on Geology, forming the Article under that head in the Seventh Edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica. By JOHN PHILLIPS, F.R.S., G.S. Professor of Geology in King's College, London, &c. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. One Vol. 8vo. Pp. 295.

"THE geologist," says Cuvier, "is an antiquary of a new order." This is not a fanciful or superficial comparison, but marks a real philosophical connexion, as regards the principles of investigation which govern the geologist and the antiquarian, when engaged in the prosecution of their respective pursuits. Organic fossil remains are the medals of creation. Both sciences endeavour to ascend to a past state, by considering what is the present state of things, and what are the causes of change. Geology examines the existing appearances of the materials which form the earth, infers from them previous conditions, and speculates concerning the forces by which one condition has been made to succeed another.

Geology, as commonly understood, includes three sciences—descriptive geology, geological dynamics, and physical geology. Of these, the last cannot yet be said to exist: we have a few unverified conjectures only. For our knowledge of the second, we are chiefly indebted to Mr. Lyell, whose "Principles of Geology," reviewed in our number for February, may be regarded as the text-book. Mr. Whewell and Mr. Hopkins have also made valuable contributions. The treatise now before us does not exclude the two sciences just named, but expatiates chiefly in the regions of descriptive geology.

Mr. Phillips's principal object has been to exemplify the most important geological truths, by discussing the phenomena in a certain order, under the guidance of admitted general principles. The business of geological science, he observes, is to combine the whole

series of observed phenomena and inferred causes into one general history of the successive conditions of our globe. The wildness of the cosmogonical theories propounded by Burnett, Whiston, and others, led those observers who formed themselves into the Geological Society in 1807, to discard all theories as premature, and to confine their own labours to the accumulation of facts. But, as Mr. Phillips observes, the time is now come when enough of *general truth* is known in geology, to direct the labours of observation into right and fertile channels. Theory and useful observation must proceed or retrograde together. The man who is not taught *what to observe* out of the overwhelming mass of phenomena which present themselves, and *how to observe*, is just as likely to mislead, by his descriptions of phenomena, as the mere theorist who leaves the true path of induction, and substitutes unverified speculations for deductions from the facts before him. Nothing is more common than to hear unqualified persons complain of the proneness of geologists to indulge in theories; as if to combine individual facts into limited generalizations, and from these to rise to generalizations of a higher order, were as unlawful in the geologist, as it is the direct duty of every other student in the regions of physical science.*

After a few introductory observations on the temperature of the globe, the depth of the ocean, and the extent of the atmosphere, Mr. Phillips proceeds to enumerate the principal minerals and rocks which it is necessary for the practical geologist to be well acquainted with, so that he may be able to recognise and distinguish them whenever he meets with them in the course of his researches. For these lists, we must refer our readers to the Treatise itself; and pass on to a passage of some length, which serves to give a good general idea of the manner in which modern geologists have arrived at an approximate acquaintance with the construction of the crust of the globe.

"It cannot, with truth, be said, that the arrangement of materials in the crust of the globe has ever been entirely unknown, because the operations of mining, however ignorantly begun and conducted, must infallibly have led to correct, though very limited, information concerning it. No considerable mining region in the civilized world has ever been visited by geologists where the structure of the metalliferous mountains has not long been partially known. What geologist has been able to add to the knowledge of this kind possessed by the old miners of Aldstone Moor? In what coal district have the workmen been found wholly ignorant of the succession of the sandstones, shales, and coal, in which their operations are conducted?

"The great step made by modern geology has been to *unite this scattered information into general truths*; and it appears unnecessary to go farther back than to Werner for the proposal of correct views on this subject in Germany; to Saussure in Switzerland; and to Smith in England. In the latter country, it is true that Mitchell had made some correct researches, more general than could be expected at the period, and Whitehurst showed himself possessed of enlarged views; but it is undoubtedly to Werner and Smith that the modern system of geology, founded on correct observations of the arrangement of rocks, owes its rapid advances.

* See Christian Remembrancer for March, 1841, vol. i. pp. 182—185.

"The essential principles admitted by both these eminent men are very simple; they affirm that the materials in the crust of the globe are generally stratified, and that the strata succeed one another in a particular order or series. . . .

"For the purpose of showing more clearly the state of knowledge on this fundamental point, we shall suppose five independent observers engaged in inquiring into it, with all the aids of local knowledge furnished by mines, collieries, and other excavations made by men, and abundance of cliffs, ravines, and mountain slopes, where nature displays her works. One of them may be situated in the vicinity of London, another in Oxfordshire, another in Yorkshire, a fourth in the region of the English lakes, a fifth in the Highlands of Scotland. . . .

"In each of these localities, the series of strata is found to be constant. Not that every particular stratum is everywhere observed; but the *order* in which they succeed one another, when present together, is *never* reversed.

"It is found by actual observation, that the chalk, which is the lowest mass of strata noticed in the vicinity of London, is continuous with, and forms a part of, that chalk which is at the top of the Oxfordshire series. It is also found that this same chalk is actually traceable, with little interruption, in a very clear and satisfactory manner, from Oxfordshire into Yorkshire, where also it forms the top of the section; that the oolitic rocks, the blue clays and limestones, the red clays and red sandstones, are, in the same way, continued from Oxfordshire to Yorkshire. The same stratified rocks, then, occur in very distant situations in the same order of succession, having certain rocks above them. If, now, we compare the Yorkshire and Cumbrian, and afterwards the Cumbrian and Scottish series of rocks, we shall find several common terms in similar parts of the series, and thus be able to unite all the five sets of observations into one general view, proving the continuity of the strata near the surface of the earth, and the constancy of their order of succession."—Pp. 29—34.

It would be inconsistent with our limits, and indeed foreign to the purpose of a reviewer, to linger among the elementary topics of this subject; but we shall give another extract from the treatise before us, on the "Origin of Stratified Rocks," because it places in a very clear point of view, one of those fundamental principles of the science, which are not to be lost sight of at any stage of geological research and speculation.

"That the stratified masses of the globe, resting upon one another in a settled order of succession, have been *deposited from water* in the same order as we now see them—the lowest first—the uppermost last—is a proposition so fully and freely admitted, that it may seem unnecessary to adduce arguments in its support; but the facts which prove the watery origin of the strata, open at the same time a great variety of other truths, and disclose so clearly the history of many great physical changes on the globe, that a full examination of them is essential to the acquisition of right fundamental views in geology. . . .

"The arguments on which we rely for the proof of the subaqueous origin of all the stratified rocks may be thus summed up.

"The stratified structure is that which is always assumed by successive depositions of sediments in water.

"The materials (clay, sand, limestone, &c.) composing the strata of the crust of the globe, are exactly similar and in the same condition, or else very analogous, to deposits now forming under water in various parts of the globe, and similarly associated.

"The organic contents of the rocks are such as admit of no other explanation, for they are mostly of marine or fresh water origin; and the few

terrestrial reliquæ which occur in them show, by various circumstances, that they were drifted from the land or overwhelmed by the sea.

"By combining all these considerations, we arrive at the positive conclusion that *all the really stratified rocks* are of aqueous origin.—Pp. 45, 55.

The unstratified rocks, on the contrary, not only want these unequivocal marks of watery action, but present decisive evidences of an igneous origin.

"The materials of which these rocks are composed are neither similar to those now deposited by water nor in a similar condition. They are not composed of sands, clays, or limestone, but of a variety of crystallized minerals, many of them the same or very similar to those produced by volcanic agency, or the artificial heat of a furnace.

"The association of these minerals into rocks is the same or very similar to the grouping of similar minerals in volcanic rocks. In several instances the products of volcanos and ancient unstratified rocks are identical. The variations of the different groups of rocks follow similar laws, and they occur under similar relations to the stratified rocks.

"In these unstratified rocks organic remains do not occur (sometimes, indeed, portions of strata containing such remains are enveloped in unstratified rocks); and from the whole evidence no doubt remains of the igneous origin of the crystallized and other unstratified rocks.

"It is very conceivable that, in particular circumstances, the effect of watery and igneous agency may be evident in the same rock. These agencies may have been contemporaneously or successively exerted; and thus combined, successive or confused results of two entirely different agencies may occasionally lead even the experienced geologist into error. But this does not affect the principle; inaccuracies of detail must often occur in descriptions and reasonings on natural phenomena, which involve various conditions and measures of force. Already, indeed, the clew is probably obtained for elucidating the *differences* as well as the *agreements* of geological phenomena, and it is not necessary to say that no natural science can pretend to have made greater progress than this; for to know the causes of general agreement, and to discover the causes of partial diversity, is the whole problem of physical science."—Pp. 56, 57.

The *natural* position of stratified rocks formed by aqueous deposition, would obviously be a horizontal one, and this, with some exceptions, is found to have been the fact.

"We are fully convinced that for broad and extensive formations of strata composed of various successions of sands, clays, and limestones, variously stored with organic remains, there can be no risk of error in assuming, as a fact sufficiently proved, that they were deposited nearly level."—P. 59.

Proceeding to inquire into the *actual* position of strata, as they are seen in the desiccated parts of the old oceanic bed which now compose our solid land, we find that the most general condition of the stratified rocks of all ages is to be not quite level, but inclined to the horizon in some one direction, and at some certain angle, in each locality.

"Over immense tracts of the earth's surface, the angle of inclination is extremely moderate; more than three-quarters of the surface of Europe (and probably of the other continents) is occupied by strata, which in common language may be said to be nearly horizontal. This character of horizontality is indeed almost exactly merited by the strata round Paris, in the Great Plains of northern Germany and Russia, the Basin of the Danube, Hungary, &c.; but as we proceed in any direction from such

centres and lines of horizontal stratification, we find the rocks to assume more and more of some prevalent inclination, so as to permit the subjacent strata to come to the surface, and present escarpments in particular directions.

"These escarpments commonly look toward the nearest range of mountains; in that direction the inclination of the strata augments continually, and at length on the slopes, or in the midst of such mountain range, we find them very steeply inclined, absolutely vertical, partially retroflexed, or bent into strange contortions.

"Among the Alps and Pyrenees, the strata, which, in every part of their surface, were originally very little inclined, and which, at a distance from the mountains, retain nearly their original position, are thrown into various disturbed positions, the local effect of violent convulsions. By a careful study of the circumstances, we observe that these indications of disturbance augment continually toward the axis or centre of the mountain group; and that the direction of the movements has there been upwards. There has been, in fact, a real and violent elevation of the stratified crust of the globe, corresponding to the centre or axis of each mountain group.

"This truth, sufficiently attested by observation in all parts of the globe, leads directly to another very important law of the phenomena of disturbed stratification. The centre or axis of the mountain group, and consequently of the disturbing movement, is generally *seen* to be a mass of unstratified rock, such as granite, sienite, &c., which shows, by a variety of circumstances, that it was not deposited in water, but rather crystallized from igneous fusion. Very often, indeed generally, proofs of its having been in a state of fusion at the time of the elevation of the strata, are found in the extension of veins of the crystallized into the sedimentary rocks, accompanied by characteristic effects of heat.

"We are thus led to associate the phenomenon of the disturbance of strata with the eruption of crystallized rock from beneath. Once acquainted with this relation of the two classes of rocks, we are in possession of a clew to guide us through all the mazes of local geology; for it is equally true of small elevations of strata, as of all mountain chains, that the most general condition observable is the mutual dependence of these disturbances and irruptions of unstratified rocks."—Pp. 59—61.

From these brief notices of the elementary facts of the science, we pass on to that portion of Mr. Phillips's Treatise which relates to descriptive geology. The basis of geological chronology is the succession of stratified rocks. The lowest are the oldest, the uppermost are the most recent. We have at present three well understood divisions,—primary, secondary, and tertiary strata. The primary strata rest on unstratified rocks, generally granitic, which appear to have undergone fusion since the deposition of strata upon them. The rocks included in the primary strata may be referred to three principal types;—the siliceous, the argillaceous, and the calcareous. Hence we have three series of systems, or great assemblages of strata in the primary division: 1. The mica slate and gneiss system, with crystalline limestones, and few or no fossils. 2. The clay slate and greywacke slate system, with some limestones and a few fossils. 3. The Silurian system; limestone, shales, &c. with many fossils. Of these, the first is the lowest and oldest; the third, the uppermost and most recent; the second, intermediate both in position and age.

The gneiss and mica-slate system presents great difficulties to the practical geologist, on the question of its stratification.

"The stratification of primary rocks is sometimes very evident and indubitable, as in the gneiss beds about Loch Sumart, in Argyleshire, the limestones of Loch Earn and Balahulish, the mica-slate of Glencroe, the chlorite-slate of Loch Lomond; but in many cases it is extremely difficult to pronounce a candid and just opinion as to whether a particular mass of such rocks is stratified or not. This arises from the causes which are found to produce partial embarrassment even among rocks of the secondary age. These are original *peculiarities of stratification*, and subsequent *change of structure* by molecular aggregation, under the influence of heat, pressure, or other general agency."—P. 73.

After a brief discussion of the various causes to confuse the evidence of stratification, Mr. Phillips arrives at the conviction that the gneiss, mica-slate, primary limestone, quartz rock, &c. are stratified rocks; the most important evidence being the alternation of these different rocks, and the lamination of different substances in them; but that the causes which tend to complicate the stratification of all rocks, even of the newest, have produced their maximum effects in these, the oldest of all. The principal of these causes, as already stated, is heat; either locally exhibited in the neighbourhood of igneous crystallized rocks, or generally pervading the whole mass of deposits. This explains one of the most perplexing circumstances in the condition of primary strata—their crystalline texture, a texture characteristic of unstratified rocks, and the grand reason for regarding them as of igneous origin; yet a texture possessed in many cases by rocks which are regarded as aqueous and stratified. Heat, pressure, and the intermixture of granite detritus, are the chief causes that have given to gneiss, mica-slate, and other really stratified rocks of the primary series, these peculiarities of molecular constitution, these features of crystalline configuration, which sometimes even predominate over the evidences of laminar and stratified arrangement.

Few mountainous districts are wholly devoid of the argillaceous primary rocks, which compose the clay-slate or greywacke slate system; but these deposits are not at all to be compared in extent with the older mica-slate and gneiss formations. The districts in Britain in which the clay-slate system unfolds into the greatest variety of formations are the Cumbrian region and North Wales. They may be reduced to two principal groups: the rocks which compose the upper group have been termed Cambrian by Professor Sedgwick; those which compose the lower group, Cumbrian.

It is to the labours of Mr. Murchison in South Wales and the bordering counties, that we are indebted for a clear knowledge of the relations of the rocks which compose the Silurian system. These have been arranged, for the present, by Mr. Murchison into two systems, the upper and lower Silurian: the former consisting of the Ludlow and Wenlock rocks; the latter of the Caradoc and Llandeilo rocks.

"At this stage in the series of deposited rocks, all doubts and difficulties as to the fact of their complete stratification vanish entirely. In the alternation of sand-stones, shales, and limestones, many of them fossiliferous,

ferous, the fossil shells and crustacea, &c. differing in the different groups, what do we recognise but the very same principle as that which was detected by Mr. Smith's researches among the oolites of Bath? *It is this close analogy between deposits so far distant in geological date as the superior primary and middle secondary rocks, which constitutes the great interest of Mr. Murchison's researches.* We who have known, step by step, the whole progress of his researches, claim the results as being peculiarly illustrative of the modern school of geology, which in all its investigations strives to detect, by a close inquiry into certain classes of phenomena among rocks of different ages, the unchangeable influences of nature.

"But there is another point of view in which the Silurian system demands our especial attention. It appears highly probable that the organic remains of this ancient system are sufficiently numerous to justify satisfactory inferences on points of the greatest importance in the philosophy of geology.

"In the first place, we must observe that these reliquiae, though perhaps specifically different from those in the older limestones and other fossiliferous rocks of the clay slate system, are mostly congeneric, of analogous structure, and similarly distinct from existing forms of life. There is evidently such an agreement of mineral and organic characters between the Silurian and clay slate systems, that both must be admitted to have been deposited under circumstances depending on the same or very similar physical conditions. That system is so linked with the mica-slate and gneiss, that the whole mass of primary strata may be conceived to be the result of physical conditions, gradually or periodically variable, but not suddenly interrupted. It appears that, in the deposition of the sub-crystalline gneiss and mica-slate rocks, mechanical agitation of the ocean was rare and slight; and that, on the contrary, in the highest group of the primary strata, the sand-stones and conglomerates indicate frequent and considerable watery disturbance.

"Nearly in the same ratio, the monuments of organic life appear and grow numerous, the limestone bands become more regular and continuous, the stratification less complicated by superimposed structures, and the characters of secondary strata appear.

"It was therefore not unphilosophical in Werner to propose for these formations, and some of those already ranked in the clay-slate system, the term *transition rocks*: such in truth they are; yet the term will probably fall into disuse, because the enlarged views of modern geologists have led them to recognise in all the varied mass of stratified rocks, only one long, though locally interrupted series, every term of which is really *transitive*, connecting the earlier and later formations."—Pp. 87—89.

The state of the globe during the period of the formation of the primary strata is an interesting but most difficult subject of inquiry to the philosophical geologist. It is remarkable that this, the lowest of all the known systems of stratified deposits, is the most extensive, the most uniform in mineral character, the only one in which no organic remains occur, and in which there is most obscurity in the character of mechanical aggregation. The most probable cause to which we must refer these facts, as marking the peculiarities of the primary strata, is the agency of subterranean heat. It is obvious that the changes produced upon the igneous rocks in a thermal ocean, would be altogether different from those occasioned by lateral movements in later times, through narrower channels of cooler water. This hypothesis is in harmony with the admitted fact of the former igneous fluidity of the mass of the globe.

The secondary strata present phenomena of great interest and

importance. The British series is one of the most complete in Europe, and sufficiently developed to serve as a general basis of comparison. The principal systems which it embraces are the carboniferous, the new red sandstone, the oolitic, and the cretaceous.

The tertiary strata furnish the materials for some of the most attractive and promising inductive reasonings of the geologist. The cretaceous formation of the secondary strata is the general basis of the tertiaries; but it is found that the tertiary strata seldom conform to the stratification of the chalk; that any gradation of cretaceous into tertiary deposits, or any alternation of them, is exceedingly rare; and that the organic remains of the one group differ almost wholly from those of the other.

"Hence it has become a popular opinion, that with the secondary strata ended a certain general condition of the globe, and with the tertiaries commenced a totally new arrangement. Moreover, because we find the marine tertiary strata distinctly related, in geographical expansion, to the present basins and arms of the ocean; as the organic remains which they contain are similar, and, in rocks of later date, identical with those of the existing races in the sea and on the land; and as the tertiary sediments are of a nature very analogous to the daily products of the sea, estuaries, tide-rivers, and lakes, there is but a step farther to unite the tertiary era with the historical period of the globe, and to place the commencement of the actual creation or arrangement of organic nature at the epoch immediately following the chalk."—P. 162.

These and other circumstances render the tertiary strata highly interesting to the inquirer into geological causes. From these strata Mr. Lyell draws the chief support of his doctrine of uniformity; while it is upon the phenomena presented by the older strata, that the advocates of the catastrophic theory rest their maintenance of the doctrine, that in the construction of the crust of the globe, periods of ordinary action have been broken by crises of unusual violence.

The question of the relation of tertiary to historical periods is replete with difficulty. The local diversities of phenomena are so great, as almost to destroy all generality in our theoretical conclusions from them. The difficulties hence arising are increased by our want of a principle by which to define the limit of least antiquity in this group of strata. What, in fact, is meant by supra-tertiary deposits? What is meant by tertiary strata? Shall we not do well to include under this title all really marine deposits posterior to the chalk, however recent? And, assuming that all the organic and inorganic phenomena produced subsequently to the cretaceous deposits, may be grouped together as composing one great system, like those adopted for earlier periods, where shall we place the point of union between the historical and geological scales of time? When did MAN, the date of whose creation is the starting point of all history, take possession of that his dwelling-place, whose history is by geology extended through periods of time which no human chronology can compute? To this question, geology gives no certain answer. All its evidence is negative. The date of the creation of man, if inscribed at all

upon any of the monuments of geology, has not yet been discovered upon the few that have hitherto been decyphered.

"But where certainty cannot be had, it is right to inquire into probabilities. It seems fair to admit, both with reference to historical testimony and sound views of the economy of creation, that the existence in any country of a considerable number of the animals which now contribute to the comforts and necessities of the human race, is evidence of the establishment, in that country, of the conditions within which Providence has restricted the existence of man. No terrestrial being is capable, by natural constitution, of sustaining such variety of external physical conditions as man can brave through the exertion of those divine faculties which lift him above the inferior tribes of creation. If, then, the bones of the horse, the ox, the deer, the dog,—of hares, rabbits, beavers, foxes, and other characteristic animals of the present creation, are found in lacustrine tertiaries, what is to prevent our receiving, as the most probable indirect inference, that the era of the creation of man had arrived when these strata were accumulated?"—P. 194.

Towards the conclusion of this Treatise, Mr. Phillips presents us with a temperate well-reasoned account of the present state of geological theory. The laws of phenomena have been unfolded to a considerable extent; the museum of descriptive geology is plentifully stored; and most geologists are of opinion that inquiries may now be prosecuted with great hopes of success into the laws of causation. These inquiries lie beyond the province and exceed the power of the men of mere observation. Those only who have studied physical science *as a whole* are able to propose leading views in any single department. A mathematical basis has at last been obtained for geology, and analysis will complete the work which observation has begun. It is to Mr. Hopkins that we are indebted for some of the most valuable contributions to this branch of the subject, in his admirable Memoirs on Physical Geology, presented to the Cambridge Philosophical Society. Mr. Phillips has given a compendious view of his profound investigations respecting the direction of the great convulsive movements of the crust of the globe. The first notions on this subject were formed by miners, who observed, as a fact of great practical importance, that the richest mineral veins ranged *east and west*, or nearly, and that these were divided by cross-courses, passing north and south, or nearly. M. de Beaumont has proposed this fact as the occasion of a new and important problem in geology.

"He supposes that disturbances of the same system or geological era are parallel to a certain great circle of the sphere; that those of different periods are related to different circles, the poles of these circular systems being very irregularly posited on the globe."—P. 263.

It is at present impossible to decide upon the soundness of this hypothesis, from the want of sufficient and consistent evidence; but that some symmetrical accordance does exist between the dislocations of a particular age in a particular region, is certain. Let us consider, first, what are the results of observation; secondly, of mathematical theory.

"In Mr. Murchison's notices of the Silurian system, and the igneous rocks associated therewith, are many proofs of the local parallelism of ridges of trap and anticlinal axes in these ancient rocks, combined with some general directions of dislocation."—P. 265.

Mr. Phillips then specifies the principal facts with regard to this system, and also with regard to the mountain limestone tracts of Yorkshire, as pointing to some common principle, which produces a tendency to local parallelism and rectangulation among the lines of dislocation in a given region. And now, let us ask, what are the results of mathematical inquiry?

"A valuable contribution for this object has lately been added to geology by Mr. Hopkins, (*Camb. Trans.*) who, from very simple and probable assumed conditions of the crust of the globe, has deduced mathematically a series of dynamical results for comparison with the observed laws of phenomena."—P. 266.

The following extract from Mr. Hopkins's Memoir exhibits his view and his methods of inquiry:—

"The hypotheses from which I set out, with respect to the action of the elevatory force, are, I conceive, as simple as the nature of the subject can admit of. I assume this force to act under portions of the earth's crust of considerable extent at any assignable depth, either with uniform intensity at every point, or in some cases, with a somewhat greater intensity at particular points, as, for instance, at points along the line of maximum elevation of an elevated range, or at other points where the actual phenomena seem to indicate a more than ordinary energy of this subterranean action. I suppose this elevatory force, whatever may be its origin, to act upon the lower surface of the uplifted mass, through the medium of some fluid, which may be conceived to be an elastic vapour, or, in other cases, a mass of matter in a state of fusion from heat. Every geologist, I conceive, who admits the action of elevatory forces at all, will be disposed to admit the legitimacy of these assumptions.

"The first effect of an elevatory force will, of course, be to raise the mass under which it acts, and to place it in a state of extension, and consequently of tension. The increase of intensity in the elevatory force must be so rapid as to give it the character of an impulsive force, in which case it would be impossible to calculate the dislocating effects of it. This intensity and that of the consequent tension will therefore be always assumed to increase continuously, till the tension become sufficient to rupture the mass, thus producing fissures and dislocations, the nature and position of which it will be the first object of our investigation to determine. These will depend partly on the elevatory forces, and partly on the resistance opposed to its action by the cohesive power of the mass. Our hypotheses respecting the constitution of the elevated masses are by no means restricted to that of perfect homogeneity; on the contrary, it will be seen that its cohesive power may vary in general according to any continuous law; and moreover, that this power, in descending along any vertical line, may vary according to any discontinuous law, so that the truth of our general results will be independent, for example, of any want of cohesion between contiguous horizontal beds of a stratified portion of the mass. Vertical or nearly vertical planes, however, along which the cohesion is much less than in the mass immediately on either side of them, may produce considerable modifications in the phenomena resulting from the action of an elevatory force. The existence of joints, for instance, or planes of cleavage, in the elevated mass, supposing the regularly jointed or slaty structure to prevail in it previously to its elevation, might affect in a most important degree the character of

these phenomena. To a mass thus constituted, these investigations must not be considered as generally applicable.

"After a very clear summary of the mathematical results of the investigation, first as to a thin lamina, acted on by one, two, or more systems of tensions, and, finally, to a mass of three dimensions, the author proceeds to apply these results to the actual case of a portion of the earth's crust, under the hypotheses respecting the action of the elevatory forces, and the cohesive power of the mass, which have been already stated.

"1. *Longitudinal Fissures*.—In the case of a mass of indefinite length, bounded laterally by two parallel lines, with the elevatory force uniform, the extension, and therefore the tension, will be entirely in a direction perpendicular to the length, so that the whole tendency will be to produce *longitudinal fissures*, or such as are *parallel to the axis of elevation*. These fissures will not commence at the surface, but at some lower portion of the mass. The whole series of stratified rocks existing above an originating line of fissure will be affected by the tension producing it; but under certain cases the fissures may not reach the surface. The width of the fissure will be nearly the same at all depths of disturbed strata (varying, however, with their elasticity). Any number of these fissures might be formed simultaneously, more, it is probable, in the deeper parts. Thus there are complete and incomplete fissures, all parallel to the axis of the uplifted tract.

"2. *Transverse Fissures*.—If the elevatory force be supposed to act with greater intensity at particular points along the general line of elevation, or an additional force be *superimposed* on an uniform force, the axis of elevation will be undulated by one or more cross ridges and hollows; and parallel to these, another system, or systems, of fissures may be produced, circumstanced like the longitudinal fissures previously mentioned, as to completeness, width, &c. but ranging across the *axis of elevation*, and approximately perpendicular to the longitudinal fissures. This result is almost independent of time: the transverse fissures may be instantaneously following, or very long subsequent to the longitudinal fissures."—Pp. 268, 269.

These deductions from theory are supported by many well-established facts. Passing over Mr. Hopkins's reasonings respecting fissures of a conical elevation, we give his explanation of "faults."

"By the decrease of the expansive forces which produced the tensions occasioning the fissures, the equilibrium of the divided parts would be destroyed, and they might rest in unequal elevation above their original level, thus producing longitudinal and transverse faults. Anticlinal, synclinal, and simple faults, are thus easily understood to be all consequences of the new positions taken by the divided rocks, upon the cessation of the sustaining forces."—P. 270.

There are many other remarkable coincidences between Mr. Hopkins's theoretical deductions and observed facts; but we must content ourselves with quoting his final conclusion.

"If the approximate accuracy of our assumptions," says Mr. Hopkins, "be allowed, as applied to the crust of the globe, it appears from our investigations that an elevated range characterized by continuous systems of longitudinal and transverse fissures, referable to the causes to which we have been assigning such phenomena, could not be produced by successive elevations of different points, by the partial action of an elevatory force. In such elevations, fissures would necessarily diverge in all directions from the central points, so that parallel systems, such as have been mentioned above, could not possibly be thus produced. Every system of parallel fissures in which no two consecutive fissures are remote from each other, must necessarily have had one simultaneous origin."

We commenced our paper by exhibiting geology as an example, and a striking and instructive one, of the palæontological, or rather we should say, of the palætiological sciences. In this class of sciences TIME is an element of the first importance; and hence we are not surprised to find that Mr. Phillips, proceeding, as he travels through his subject, from individual facts to limited generalizations, and from these to generalizations of higher order and wider range, concludes his comprehensive and masterly essay with a brief dissertation on "geological time."

"The true scale of geological chronology is that of the stratified rocks. . . . The several systems of strata mark periods more or less exactly definable: the last, or supertertiary period, which descends to the present era of the globe, being as yet one of the least defined in its limits.

"It has been already explained that historical time, commencing with the human race, is not yet united to geological time. Whenever the exact place of the creation of man, on the scale of geological phenomena, can be fixed, and the two scales continuously united, we may be able to advance, without certainty of utter failure, to the consideration of the problem lately proposed for a prize essay by the Royal Society of London, viz. the translation of geological into astronomical periods.

"At present the chronology of the globe, starting from the origin of the stratified rocks, and including the whole series of successions of organic beings, and all the convulsive disturbances of the cooled and consolidated crust, recognises many successive periods of unknown duration. Neither does it appear possible to know their duration, or even the limits of error within which they fall. How, then, it may be asked, do geologists justify their confident assertions of the very great antiquity of particular rocks as compared with a few thousand years of history? To this the reply is simple. Many of the ancient stratified rocks were formed in the sea by processes perfectly similar to those which go on at this day; and, in some cases, we may believe, not at all more rapid in their effects. The laminated sandstones often mark what appears to be the ripple of a gentle tide and the successive deposits of agitated water; the shelly limestones sometimes prove very slow deposition of even a single layer of calcareous rock; the alternation of igneous and sedimentary rocks gives us the similitude of volcanic submarine eruptions. Now, if we compare with the sedimentary strata of any particular period the most similar products of the present day,—the new land on the Adriatic,—the filling up of the Nile Valley,—the shallowing of the Bay of Bengal,—we shall be impressed with the necessity of allowing a long period for the production of a single stratified formation.

"Again, if we recollect, that during these periods many creations of new and destructions of old races of animals and plants happened,—and that, ever since the records of human art, the embalmed body or sculptured effigies, have given the means of judging, no change has happened to modern races; that two or three thousand years have not changed the forms of animals known to the early Egyptians; we shall see the impropriety of imagining such changes to have been of quick succession in the earlier eras of nature.

"And when we behold conglomerate rocks which hold fragments of other earlier deposits, and in these fragments, the organic remains of still earlier periods which had already undergone their peculiar mineral changes; when we collect the history of such an organic form,—its existence in the sea,—its sepulture in a vast oceanic deposit of limestone, or in a littoral aggregation of sandstone, the induration of this rock,—its uplifting by subterranean forces,—the rolling of it to pebbles,—the reunion of them in a totally different kind of substance,—it is evident that no greater folly can be com-

mitted than to think to serve the cause of truth by contracting the long periods of geology into the compass of a few thousand years. . . .

"It is evident that we have no knowledge capable of being employed in the magnificent problem of the age of the crust of the globe, at all equal to the difficulty which meets us on the very threshold. Until the constants of nature which relate to the dependence of organic or inorganic phenomena on annual periods be known, the determination of the antiquity of any of the marine stratified rocks must be despaired of."—Pp. 291—295.

No philosopher has treated the grave questions involved in this part of the subject with greater candour, moderation, soundness and success, than Mr. Whewell, in his two invaluable works on the History and the Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences; with a thoughtful passage from the former of which, we shall now bring this paper to a conclusion.

"All palætiological sciences," says Mr. Whewell, "all speculations which attempt to ascend from the present to the remote past by the chain of causation, do also, by an inevitable consequence, urge us to look for the beginning of the state of things we thus contemplate; but in none of these cases have men been able, by the aid of science, to arrive at a beginning which is homogeneous with the known course of events. The first origin of language, of civilization, of law and government, cannot be clearly made out by reasoning and research; and just as little, we may expect, will a knowledge of the origin of the existing and extinct species of plants and animals, be the result of physiological and geological investigation.

"But though philosophers have never yet demonstrated, and perhaps never will be able to demonstrate, what was the primitive state of things in the social and material worlds, from which the progressive state took its first departure; they can still, in all the lines of research to which we have referred, go very far back;—determine many of the remote circumstances of the past sequence of events;—ascend to a point which, from our position at least, seems to be near the origin;—and exclude many suppositions respecting the origin itself. Whether, by the light of reason alone, men will ever be able to do more than this, it is difficult to say. It is, I think, no irrational opinion, even on grounds of philosophical analogy alone, that in all those sciences which look back and seek a beginning of things, we may be unable to arrive at a consistent and definite belief, without having recourse to other grounds of truth, as well as to historical research and scientific reasoning. When our thoughts would apprehend steadily the creation of things, we find that we are obliged to summon up other ideas than those which regulate the pursuit of scientific truths;—to call in other powers than those to which we refer natural events: it cannot, then, be considered as very surprising, if, in this part of our inquiry, we are compelled to look for other than the ordinary evidence of science.

"Geology, forming one of the palætiological class of sciences, which trace back the history of the earth and its inhabitants on philosophical grounds, is thus associated with a number of other kinds of research, which are concerned about language, law, art, and consequently about the internal faculties of man, his thoughts, his social habits, his conception of right, his love of beauty. Geology being thus brought into the atmosphere of moral and mental speculations, it may be expected that her investigations of the probable past will share an influence common to them: and that she will not be allowed to point to an origin of her own, a mere physical beginning of things; but that, as she approaches towards such a goal, she will be led to see that it is the origin of many trains of events, the point of convergence of many lines. It may be, that, instead of being allowed to travel up to this focus of being, we are only able to estimate its place and nature, and to

form of it such a judgment as this;—that it is not only the source of mere vegetable and animal life, but also of rational and social life, language and arts, law and order; in short, of all the progressive tendencies by which the highest principles of the intellectual and moral world have been and are developed, as well as of the succession of organic forms, which we find scattered, dead or living, over the earth. . . .

“But such a train of thought must be pursued with caution. Although it may not be possible to arrive at a right conviction respecting the origin of the world, without having recourse to other than physical considerations, and to other than geological evidence; yet extraneous considerations, and extraneous evidence, respecting the nature of the beginning of things, must never be allowed to influence our physics or our geology. Our geological dynamics, like our astronomical dynamics, may be inadequate to carry us back to an origin of that state of things, of which it explains the progress: but this deficiency must be supplied, not by adding supernatural to natural geological dynamics, but by accepting, in their proper place, the views supplied by a portion of knowledge of a different character and order. If we include in theology the speculations to which we have recourse for this purpose, we must exclude them from geology. The two sciences may conspire, not by having any part in common; but because, though widely diverse in their lines, both point to a mysterious and invisible origin of the world.”

Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in Controversy with the Arians: translated, with Notes and Indices: being part of Vol. VIII. of a Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the Division of the East and West. Translated by Members of the English Church. Oxford: J. H. Parker. London: Rivingtons. 8vo., pp. 280.

IN a former article on the controversial treatises of St. Athanasius, we adverted, in somewhat general terms, to the uncompromising spirit of the more eminent of the fathers, of whom St. Athanasius is a noble example, as displayed in times which may be called the era of controversy,—and to the self-sacrifice which a consistent course of conduct in such men necessarily involved: and these characteristics of a better age we contrasted with the liberalism and indifferentism of the present day, or, at least, of the generation that is now passing by; for there are many indications that a better spirit is rising up in the Church, and that, though it seemed but lately to be a little leaven, yet it is now working so powerfully, and so rapidly, that it promises, with the blessing of God, soon to leaven the whole lump.

But whether or no we shall live to see a day fairly characterised, as that of St. Athanasius was, by an unflinching and self-sacrificing adherence to the truth in the midst of the greatest difficulties; this, at least, is clear—that we do even now see a day, like that of St. Athanasius, marked with controversy and the conflict of opposite principles. It was the conviction, that, in this respect, the position of the Church is the same now that it was then, that induced us to enter

upon the subject in the first instance, and which must now plead our excuse for continuing it. We do not mean that the same subjects are not now discussed within the Church that were agitated at and after the Council of Nice; on the contrary, though the Arian heresy still exists, and though the rationalism of the day certainly tends to the same end, we are, on the whole, wonderfully free from that heresy; but controversy, though on other subjects, is now, as it was then, more the business of almost all persons than perhaps it has ever been since the rise and fall of the Arian heresy, except at the Reformation,—that other season of most mighty conflict, when all the furies of a religious war were let loose to astonish the world and the Church. We live, then, in an age of controversy, and our enemies will surely enough thrust all its troubles and its evils upon us; but we must strive, and study, and pray, that we may not be without the strength and confidence of true faith in our hearts, and the godly weapons wherewith truth is to be defended from the attacks of her foes.

If there is any justice in these remarks, How great is the responsibility of those who are set as teachers in the Church; and from whom, humanly speaking, those under their charge will receive the truth in sincerity, confidence, and well-grounded assurance, or in doubtfulness and timid indecision! We will not suppose the case of those who teach out of the Church, and whose doctrine is simply erroneous; but setting these aside, it is clear that one kind of teaching has a natural fitness to make men adhere to the truth against all assaults, whether of sophistry or violence,—that another kind of teaching just as naturally tends to leave them at the mercy of every wind of doctrine. The question is then, What kind of teaching is really adapted to times of controversy, such as we are now living in?

We do not hesitate to say that the present times especially demand, what is really best in all times, that the teaching of all appointed to that high office in the Church, from the parents and sponsors of the infant Christian, to the highest minister in the Church, should be *dogmatic, positive, and exclusive*: *dogmatic*, as opposed to the vagueness and indistinctness of those who are not themselves well grounded in the doctrines which they have to teach; *positive*, as opposed to that pure protestantism which places religion rather in destruction than in edification,—rather in denying what is possibly false, than in holding what is certainly true; and *exclusive*, in opposition to the liberalism which makes sincerity everything, and truth nothing,—which makes catholic doctrine and all the errors of dissent absolutely equal, as affecting the condition of men, and as pleasing or displeasing in the sight of God.

Whether or no the Church of England would commit her children to the *discipline* of such teaching as we are advocating, or to the *licence* against which we protest, none can doubt with the formularies of the Church before him. She has not only retained all the three creeds which were used in the Church catholic before the Reformation, and which even Churches episcopal, catholic, and apostolic, in other

regions, have either modified or rejected,* (not, indeed, so as to make them teach other doctrine, which would be absolutely wrong, but so as to make their witness less precise and definite,) but she has provided for the instruction of her very children, a catechism perfectly and excellently dogmatic in all its parts; and by no means the least so, where it is conversant with matters controverted most fiercely when that formulary was prepared, as well as now. The first portion of the Catechism touching Holy Baptism, and the last touching that and the other great sacrament of the Christian Church, amply witness for this; and exemplify most admirably the simple assured way of stating positive dogmas, which is really the most wholesome for all who are to walk in a world where there are temptations to error in doctrine, as well as to vice and immorality in conduct. How would it be possible for one who has really been taught, from a child, according to the plan which the Church has laid down—first in the catechism,—then directly in sermons and homilies, framed either by authority or by the ordained and competent ministers in harmony with that formulary, and with the consent of catholic doctors,—and always indirectly, (though teaching is not the highest and direct office of prayer) in the language which she constantly uses in approaching the Divine presence—how would it be possible for one thus taught from the beginning, and thus persisting to learn, when he has come to years of discretion, to doubt for an instant the dogmas of baptismal regeneration, or of the real presence in the blessed Eucharist? How is it possible that he could hear with patience those who would reason upon these things, not as truths determined beyond the reach of argument to affect them, or the need of argument to support them, but as questionable figments, at the very best, of fallible men; or perhaps as absolute errors, which indeed the Church always held for fifteen hundred years, but which have now at last been proved to be false?

Nor does such teaching promise less important results on the holiness and consistent christian conduct of those who receive it, than on their firm adherence to the articles of the Christian faith. And here we speak with the more confidence, because we use words of authority. "How little," says the Bishop of London, after having stated the doctrine of the Church concerning Baptism, "are these solemn and important ends of Holy Baptism considered and laid to heart by christian parents, who bring their children to the font! How few are there who seriously reflect, that in so doing they are *adding to the Church those who are to be saved*; and that it mainly depends upon their own prayers, and instruction, and example, whether the

* For instance, in the Church in America, to which we look always with the love and interest of brethren, and sometimes almost with a feeling of inferiority on our own part, there are little blots, if we may dare so to call them, of this kind. "Either the Apostles' creed, or the Nicene creed may be used at the discretion of the minister: in the Apostles' creed any minister may omit the words, He descended into hell, or may instead of them use the words, He went into the place of departed spirits; and we must deeply regret that the Athanasian creed is omitted altogether."—See the *History of the Church in America, in the Christian Miscellany*. Green. Leeds.

tender branches, so grafted into the true Vine, shall be fed with the sap of holy doctrine and principle, and grow up to be *trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord*, fit to be transferred, in due season, to the paradise of God; or whether they shall be like the branches of which our Saviour speaks, which, because they abide not in Him, *are withered*, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." *

Now, how did such doctrines as those which we have chosen by way of example to illustrate the teaching of our own Church, present themselves to the minds of the primitive and elder Christians? Was it in the same form in which we are persuaded they would present themselves to Anglican Churchmen, if our teaching in practice really equalled our teaching in theory; or was it dimly, doubtfully, and as questions to be solved and contested? Surely we need not be at a loss for an answer to this question; and as surely we need not doubt whether they or we were in the happier and higher state of Christian religion. But let us take an instance. Pelagius originates certain opinions concerning the state of man by nature, contrary to the received doctrines of the Church: and he is met by one of the very doctrines which we have mentioned, which is stated as fixed and certain, *i. e.* the doctrine of baptismal regeneration: for where is the difficulty in believing that sin and death may come in at our natural birth, when we already believe that holiness and heaven may come at our spiritual birth? wherefore are children baptized or regenerated, except that they have an original stain to wash away? Thus is a doctrine taken for granted, and set before any opinion, and made a sufficient refutation of it; whereas now-a-days men test doctrine by opinion, instead of judging opinion by doctrine. Such an argument now would provoke men to deny the doctrine, that their opinion might stand. They would say, We deny that holiness and heaven are bestowed at the second birth; we deny that children need be baptized; it is doubtful at least, and we will not let you take it for granted: and thus we are driven back from one point to another, until at last we are set to prove that there is a God, or at least that there is a revelation; just because opinion, and *à priori* reasoning, may sometimes be arrayed against the articles of the Christian Faith.

Again, with regard to the real presence in the holy Eucharist, we are now scarcely permitted to speak of it without all its limitations; so much are Christians afraid of the doctrine, and so contrary does it sound to opinion and the natural reason. *Erewhile* it was an axiom, and used to oppose new and false opinions and dangerous innovations in practice. If some would have pictures and images, they were told that they could not be needed, when Jesus Christ Himself was really present in the holy Eucharist. *Now*, subsequent error would be produced as evidence against the prior truth; and it would be said, (or reasoning would be used which would imply as much,) that the doctrine

* Three Sermons on the Church, p. 9.

of the real presence is false, because it has been abused to idolatry, and because it has been the origin of false opinions in the minds of others, as to the manner of its subsistence. Thus we cease to use ascertained doctrine as bulwarks against the irruption of errors and abuses; and actually, however illogical the process may be, gather arms with which to attack the doctrine from subsequent opinions and usages.

This we should be prevented from doing if we were boldly taught after the firm and positive dogmatic manner of the Church Catechism. Then doctrines would be as tests; and all opinions and practices not already sanctioned by the prescriptive rights of the Church, would be made to submit to their touch. We do not mean that there would be no *liberty* of opinion, and no way opened for new rites and ceremonies;—this would prove our reasoning false at once, for there are, and ought to be, subjects, even in theology, on which opinion is free—and it is important enough to be asserted in one of our articles that the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies;* which, of course, implies that mere ceremonies may well be added, and that some may perhaps be changed—but we do mean that there would be less *licence* of opinion,—less of the boasted right of private judgment,—and less of the state of things in which every man doeth that which is right in his own eyes. Faith would be exalted, as it ought to be, above every faculty of the mind, and every affection of the heart; and a well ascertained dogma, (each one, for instance, in either of the three creeds,) would be to it as a firm resting-place to the feet, as an ascertained fact to the memory, or as an axiom or prior demonstration to the mind. It would ask no farther proof, and admit of no question.

As for the spirit of pure Protestantism, which places religion rather in the denial of what is possibly false, than in the holding of what is certainly true, and which is opposed to positive theology, it is needless to observe, that it made no part of the religious feeling of Churchmen in the primitive times; and that it is one of the evils, as manifested within the Church, of the great struggle against the corruptions of Popery at the Reformation: yet it may not be amiss to note that it was the character of the Arian heretics, and that it was exemplified in them almost to as great an extent as it is in ultra-protestants within or without the Church. The learned translator of the controversial treatises of St. Athanasius observes, that—

“The Arians, perhaps more than any other heretics, were remarkable for bringing objections against the received view, rather than forming a consistent theory of their own. Indeed, the very vigour and success of their assault upon the truth lay in its being a mere assault, not a positive and substantive teaching.”—P. 235, note.

How exactly is this the case with the pure Protestantism, not of the Church, (*μη γένοιτο*,) but of some persons within the Church,

* Article XX.

and of many sects without the Church at the present day ! Their whole task seems to be to pull down what the Church has built up ; and since man is even more powerful in destruction than in composition, they have a kind of power by no means to be despised. And yet their work will really be like that of which the above extract speaks, formidable for a time only, and at last utterly destroyed before positive truth ; for while the way of protesting, and objecting, and assaulting, is indeed strong to annoy, and to pervert, and to throw down, it has no substantive character of its own. It is as the tide that breaks in foam only over the rocky coast, and glides over the soft and shifting sands almost unmarked. And as the rock, swept by many storms, outlasts them all, so it is with the truth, ever presenting the same front to the noisy approach of envious and quibbling objections. Beaten upon it is, and ever will be ; but there it is unmoved, while the very succession of various attacks serves only to erase the impressions of each other :—

*"Hæc illam, sed et hanc non minus illa premit,
Volvitur et volvit pariter, motuque perenni
Truditur a fluctu posteriore prior."*

As for the ultra-Protestantism of the present day, it is remarkable that it is scarcely positive by negation, if we may use such a term, *i. e.* it scarcely grapples with positive substantive opinions, whether true or false, even to oppose them. Take for example the controversy against Anglo-Catholic theology now carried on within the Church ; Is it not obvious that, instead of seizing upon some positive doctrine or custom, the adversaries shroud themselves not only in their own generalities, but even generalize the opinions which they would attack ; though they might easily enough, if they would, lay hold on something tangible at the least, however weak, or however sturdy they might find it, to brave their assault ? We hear a great deal about the popery of the Oxford Tracts for instance, and about the sacramentarian heresy of the Churchman, and about the insidious growth of priestcraft ; and we are not exaggerating when we say, that those who speak thus have not only never seriously set themselves to oppose a single specific opinion involved in these terms, but have not even read a single work which they condemn. They think it a grander thing, forsooth, to attack a principle, and to tear up a vigorous sapling all at once, with a hand blindly feeling for the root, without deigning to be directed to it by the fruit, the branches, and the trunk. They forget that, for all purposes of polemics, principles are not to be assumed as those of the adversary, and then all his opinions to be referred to them ; but such principles are to be arrived at by a long process of induction, so that men really cannot, if they would, avoid the study of the particulars, without falsely imputing generals, and most weakly warring against them. It is, indeed, a grand thing to root up a vicious principle at one pull ; but who ever did it, until he had mastered the details of the controversy ? What will become of our Church, if ever it has to oppose Popery in earnest, in this

unreal, general, merely Protestant way? If there are any who really think, as they seem to think, that, in opposing Church principles, they are skirmishing with the advanced troops of Popery, and essaying the arms that they must wield in a mightier conflict, we may well warn them that they are giving the promise of no very formidable antagonism against a mighty foe.

It was not so, in truth, that our really great champions fought the cause of truth against multifold errors. They first understood and defined the error, and placed it in its substantive form, and then demolished it. Take such works as Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, for instance, and Cosin on the Canon: here is no affectation of rooting up a vicious principle at once; no noisy flourish of trumpets, without a single well-directed assault; but each position is marked out, and attacked, and cut off in detail. Again, in Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, there is as rich and full an enunciation of principles as ever was put forth by one man; but this does not stand in the stead of a patient and laborious study of the particular points of the adversary's position: if it had done, we will not say that puritanism would have been victorious, for we had other champions, but against Hooker it would certainly have stood unabashed.

Most interesting, then, is the question, How far did the Church of England yield to this merely Protestant spirit, which was most assuredly let loose upon the Church at the Reformation? for if she was wholly actuated by it, wonderful it were that she has stood so long; and in however great a degree she gave way to it, just in that same proportion she cut off the strength of her own position.

Now to say absolutely that she yielded to that spirit not at all, would perhaps be false; but to say that she yielded very, very little, is most true. All her formularies attest this, and all her apologetic prefaces, though they were put forth on the spur of the occasion, when most we should expect a contrary tone to have pervaded them. She was never afraid of holding a positive truth, because it seemed to be allied with error, or to be followed by inconvenient conclusions. She was not afraid of an hierarchy, and of the Apostolic succession, because they were held by Rome, and classed by some with papal error. She was not afraid of the very highest statements of the dignity and virtue of the Holy Sacraments, because of the newly named error of sacramentarianism on the one hand, or because of the *opus operatum* and transubstantiation, on the other. She did not deny the Church to be one, holy, catholic, apostolic, because it was a most popular and convenient, though a most unjust inference, that she was falling into schism; nor did she shrink from that use of Scripture which might *seem* to lay her open to objection, while it certainly placed her in the position of a maintainer of positive truth, without a timid anticipation of consequences. Even now, so long after the actual conflict, we doubt whether many would not choose for the Epistle and Gospel for Saint Peter's day, some prophecy of Antichrist, or the great apostasy; but the Church of England, above such artifices, and

knowing that the positive truth is with her, appoints for the holy Gospel the place where it is written—

“Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

Such things as these are only among the many indications of the positive character of Anglican doctrine, as distinguished from any cowardly or captious Protestantism. Protest, indeed, the Church in England did, and that most vehemently, and to the death, against error; but it was against specific definable error, and not under the careless pretence of condemning a principle or two, without separately examining its results: it was so as to retain a body of truth so great, that the very assaults of her enemies are continually affording her the best testimony. While all heresies, of the most opposite characters, have so much to object against us, well may we hope that we are founded on *the rock*.

We trust that we have satisfactorily shown that the theology best adapted to maintain its hold in days of controversy, is *dogmatic* and *positive*; and that the teaching and position of the Church of England are in these respects such as have the testimony of the choicest spirits, in those times which are almost *par excellence* the days of successful controversy. We proceed to give a few reasons for the assertion that our theology should also be *exclusive* in its tone and pretensions; in opposition, not only to the heresies and schisms actually in existence, but also to the fashionable liberalism, which makes sincerity everything and truth nothing; which exalts subjective at the expense of objective faith; which makes catholicity and heresy equal, as affecting the salvation of men, and as pleasing in the sight of the Most High.

Considering that *à priori* reasoning is the source of half the errors upon such subjects, one may almost wonder that liberalism has ever become so fashionable as it is; since it seems most probable, (nay, we may almost say most certain,) from the very nature of things, that religious truth, which is conversant with the will, and attributes, and works, and revelation, and person of the one God of truth, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning, must be *one* and *exclusive*; and since HE is not only a merciful, but also a jealous God, it would seem difficult to believe, (though it is clear that many do believe,) that it can be indifferent in HIS eyes, and therefore unimportant to our eternal interests, whether we hold the truth or not. But the fact is, that while we are perhaps on the verge of a struggle with Popery on the one hand, and all the forms of Protestant dissent on the other, such as we have never yet had to wage against both together; we have been getting more and more convinced that

the truth is not, after all, worth contending about, since God will mercifully accept the sincere of all sects and parties. A sad preparation this for such a struggle!

And yet, is it not clear that this is the tendency of at least one modern school, and that a very large one, though not influential in proportion to its numbers, because weakness is one of its elements? Against doctrines which are commonly called High Church, what is the most popular argument? Simply this,—that they unchurch other protestant communities; i. e. *that they are exclusive*. There is no attempt made, or at least none of proportionate energy, to prove that those communities are churches: this is not the point with the liberalist; this is or is not a truth, and is left, like other things of the like kind, indifferent. The great burden of the cry is, that a rule, right or wrong, is upheld which tends to the exclusion of some: the complaint against us is, not that we hold error, but that we cannot be content to hold so much of the truth, and no more, as is consistent with the equal pretensions of others. Then we have works of all kinds and on all subjects, not excepting even religion itself, which are avowedly so contrived as to offend no party; which are, in other words, so enervated in style, and so utterly deprived of all positive truth which advances a single step beyond Deism, that they can shock no person whoever,* except only the consistent Churchman. And even high minds lend themselves to this compact with error, and to this implied insult to the truth. We have a History of Christianity by one whose learning and talents would have ranked him among the best and most powerful writers of the day, if he had not fallen into this snare, avowedly written upon the principle that a Churchman may so write, and Churchmen so read a history of Christianity, as if they were viewing it from without; might take nothing more for granted, at the very most, than that *some kind* or *modification* of Christianity is true; that one may describe or read of all the great contests against heresies within the Church, and schisms without, as if they were moral phenomena,—of much interest, it is true, for the passions and talents which they set in action, and for the interesting occurrences by which they are marked,—but, so far as truth is concerned, absolutely indifferent.

And it is terrible to mark into how great practical evils such principles lead men. Of this it would be difficult to find more glaring

* It might be a curious speculation, how far a man might perhaps advance in asserting anything not merely rational without offending the public ear. One would have thought that Neander was not much in danger of offending in this way, yet the translator of his life of Chrysostom feels obliged to apologize for the account which the author gives of some apparently miraculous events, and accordingly adds, in a note,—“The above is literally translated from the German of Neander. I fear that it may offend some persons; but, without offering any opinion of my own, I will only ask, who will be bold enough to fix the limits of influence between the visible and material and the invisible and spiritual world? How much that is unseen, and which science has discovered, works even in the external world.”—P. 41.

instances than some that occur in "Hey's Lectures on Divinity," a work than which few are better worth reading to those whose principles are already fixed on a better basis in this respect than the author exemplifies, and who can read eclectically. But what must have been the effect of a Norrisian professor speaking *ex cathedra* to the students of Cambridge, advocating the use of Scripture language by different persons, in different senses, as one of the probable means of union between the Church and dissenters; and that too in so solemn a thing as prayer to the Divine Being? It is quite shocking to hear the Professor ask, "Why should any Christian" (meaning to include in the term "Christian" Socinians and other heretics) "object to such an address as the following?"

"O thou, who in the beginning wast with God, and wast God—Thou, by whom all things were created, that are in heaven and earth—Thou, in whose name all men are by baptism admitted into the new and last dispensation of God, and made partakers of the new covenant; at thy name every knee shall bow:—hear us; intercede for us; mediate between our Judge and us; be thou our advocate with the Father; thou, who sittest at the right hand of the Majesty on high. Send to us the *Comforter*, which is the Holy Ghost; thou, who knewest no sin, and hadst power on earth to forgive sins, help us, who are concluded under sin. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, let us not lose any of the benefits of thy stupendous sacrifice!"—This form of address might content *us*, and need not, one would think, disgust those who *dissent* from us. It might be much enlarged without departing from Scripture.*

That such a scheme, implying that the letter, and not the truth of holy writ, is that with which alone we are concerned, even independently of its being wrong in itself, were quite inconsistent with the true strength and purity of the Church, who does not see? That it would have revolted such men as St. Athanasius is too clear to demand proof; that he himself would have rather died than fall into it, will be manifest from the brief sketch of his life, which we gave in the former article. And if it should seem that in quoting or referring to individual fathers whose works have come down to us, we do not apply a fair test to the theological tone which prevailed in their age, we may refer the reader to the records of the Council of Carthage held on the subject of the baptism of heretics, where he will see precisely the same tone running through all the eighty-five suffrages there delivered by as many bishops, few of them of sufficient note to be remembered by any other act or word of their lives. No. It is quite clear, that in times when men were often called upon to lay down their lives for the great truth of Christianity, they were not so indifferent as it might perhaps be suspected, to any portion of the truth. It is very easy to *say* that we are now become opinionative, and positive, and exclusive, in small matters, because we are saved the greater controversy with fire and the sword; but those who would *prove* such a position will find history sorely against them.

* Hey's Lectures, vol. ii. p. 257.

But what is the character of the Church of England in this respect? The proof lies in a small compass. We have not only the damnatory clauses (as they are sometimes called) of the Athanasian Creed retained, together with all that is positive in doctrine; but we have a definition of the Church, which on comparison with her ordinal, and known doctrine of the sacraments, must be taken as excluding many who call themselves Christians; and the eighteenth article is expressly to the point, and most stringent:—

“They are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.”

A subject such as this cannot be fully discussed within so short a space as that allowed to an article in a review; nor do we venture to believe that we have done more than suggest a few thoughts which may lead to important conclusions, if they be followed up—to conclusions no less important than these;—that if we are (as all seem to admit) approaching a time of very severe conflict with heresy and schism, we cannot be making worse preparation than by indulging in a habit of thought which makes light of differences in faith, and altogether merges truth of doctrine in moral rectitude, or treats questions of theology as if certainty of doctrine could not be attained; whereas a clear rule of moral duty cannot be missed;—that, for our teaching, it should be positive, and conversant with substantive truths; not with mere feelings and vague speculations and opinions, but with what is defined and ruled by the Church;—that, for our learning, whether as children or as grown men and women, whose education never ceases, it should be not merely a play of intellect, a kind of mental exercise, of which pleasing excitement, or the improvement of the mind, as separate from the superlative value of the acquisition, is the end; but that it should be a discipline, a moral training, a high gymnasium, in which the intellect is to be subdued as well as exercised, and in which faith, not reason, is to be supreme;—and, finally, that we must habituate ourselves to the fact, which,—whether we will have it so or no, is a fact,—that truth and error are not indifferent, either in religion or in morals; nor ought to be held so by man, since they will not be judged so by God.

And if any fear for an instant that all this involves the slightest breach of charity, let them listen to St. Athanasius, who, next after the holy apostles themselves, may be called the very type of those who would uphold positive truth, to the exclusion of all error, and maintain catholic unity to the exclusion of all heretics. Thus, then, does he write:—

“What I have learned myself, and heard men of judgment say, I have written in few words; but ye remaining on the foundation of the Apostles, and holding fast the traditions of the Fathers, pray that now at length all strife and rivalry may cease, and the futile questions of the heretics may be

condemned, and all logomachy; and the guilty and murderous heresy of the Arians may disappear, and the truth may shine again in the hearts of all, so that all everywhere may say the very same thing, and think the same thing; and that, no Arian contumelies remaining, it may be said and confessed in every Church, *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through Whom to the Father be the glory and the strength, unto ages of ages. Amen."—P. 157.

Report of the Cambridge Camden Society for 1842. Cambridge. 1842.

The Ecclesiologist: published by the Cambridge Camden Society. Nos. VI. VII. April, 1840.

THE most interesting feature in this Report is a very pleasing address, delivered, it seems, by the worthy President at the third anniversary meeting. In the course of it, he makes some allusion to the censures, more or less modified, with which the Society's publications have now and then been visited, expressing himself as follows:—

"These considerations at least I may be allowed to plead in excuse for past errors or oversights, such as are inseparable from the acts of a body so circumstanced and so organized: and they will, I hope, still be allowed their full value, so far as consists with the interests of truth and modesty, if it shall be found that, while pursuing our vocation with an activity which may incur the charge of precipitation, but which appears to us no more than is necessary for the timely arresting of widely spread and growing evil, and for securing the steps already gained in the recognition of better principles in Church Architecture, we are thankful for kindly correction, and obedient to the rod. This we have ever been, or wished to be; and have felt, as we would desire to show, how welcome is remonstrance, when conveyed in the tone of considerate kindness, and from those who understand the subject of which they speak. All such generous antagonists we would hope in every case to convert into active allies. By such it will be understood how, under the circumstances I have described, the most trifling accident may generate an oversight, and the same necessity deny the means of repairing it; how difficult it is to foresee how each sentence in the writings of different authors will affect different readers, or to obviate an improper effect without compromising some truth or principle: such moreover will make allowances for, and will at the same time know how many there are incapable of making allowances for, that buoyancy of playful wit and sportive fancy, which, fostered by familiarity with the spirit of ancient literature, ranges over new fields with a freedom exactly proportioned to its innocence of offence, and its unconsciousness of the number and dignity of the spectators it may have attracted. To such therefore we would show ourselves ever thankful, and teachable to all: if we were not, we can scarcely be supposed blind to the natural consequences of provoking chastisement, which if deserved must destroy our credit and impair our usefulness, and which so many hands are at any moment lifted to administer."—Pp. 6, 7.

In a note he thus particularizes the "generous antagonists" in question.

"I allude particularly to the *British Critic*, (April 1842, p. 554,) and to the letters about Over Church in the *Cambridge Chronicle*; also to the re-

sion of the three Tracts to Churchwardens and to Church-builders, as well as to a large mass of correspondence connected with these, and with other publications and proceedings of the Society."—P. 6.

From this it would seem, either that the excellent President did not know of our having taken the liberty of censuring the Camden Society, (a supposition which, make it who will, we, for our own parts, altogether refuse to entertain, as base, derogatory, and insulting,) or else that we are not "generous antagonists,"—or that we do not "understand the subject of which we speak." We do not mean to enter on the question of our own architectural qualifications; but in order to show that we are not *ungenerous antagonists*, we will shortly discuss our feelings towards the Camden Society, and the grounds and amount of our quarrel with it.

We entertain, and can entertain towards it no sort of ill-will. Its existence in the honoured place to which it belongs is a circumstance to us altogether agreeable. We rejoice at every new proof of the energy of its operations, and we heartily wish them success. Putting the flippancy of some of its publications out of the question, our sole quarrel with it is on the ground of its opinions. These seem to us at once bigotted and shallow, and we are sure that their prevalence is a great hindrance to the cause of good Church-building.

It is well known that the Ecclesiologist is the literary organ of the Camden Society, and that the writers of that journal are avowed disciples of Mr. Pugin. Accordingly, they lay down with him the first principle, that the Gothic styles are the only Christian ones, and that no one, penetrated with the genius of the Christian dispensation will, whatever be the circumstances, select any other in which to build a church, north of the Alps at least. Grecian, Roman, and Italian, are marked off as *Pagan* styles; in consequence of which, nearly every church, in Italy built since the revival, including St. Peter's, and that of St. John Lateran*—St. Paul's, and almost every church in London built by Wren or his disciples, are under an *ipso facto* excommunication. Monstrous as this anathematizing seems, Mr. Pugin and the Camden Society, if we understand them aright, mean no less.

We entered somewhat on the subject in March, and endeavoured to show the total want of ground for selecting one particular style or series of styles, as alone Christian or Catholic. We proved that, if we are to decide the question by facts, there exists none in which the three great tests of Catholicity combine, and that pointed Gothic is

* The multiplicity and inconsistency of the subordinate aims which Rome proposes to herself are truly amazing, and would be altogether inexplicable, did we not remember her thorough knowledge of human nature, and clear perception of men's readiness to think precisely as they are bid. Mr. Pugin is her servant, and his labours are devoted to the advancement of her cause, through the increasing taste for Gothic architecture, which he undertakes to direct, and to connect with her peculiarities. Yet it seems an odd way of using art as a mean of proselytizing, to teach men to regard the mighty temple built over the remains of the prince of the Apostles, and the almost more divinely beautiful mother and mistress of all Churches—the whole world's Cathedral, according to Romanists—as Pagan edifices.

not even that in which we find ourselves nearest to such a combination. From all this the moral seemed to be, what we endeavoured to enforce,—the propriety of copying such an example as Mr. Petit's, and those like him, who, "looking upon a church, of whatever date, *as a church*, set themselves, according to the best of their ability, to inquire how far, taken as it is, and as a work of art, it comes up to their ideal of a Christian temple." That the Camdenites refused to be convinced by our arguments is pretty plain from their subsequent proceedings,—from none more than their review of Mr. Petit's book, on which we mean by and by to bestow some examination. Not merely with a reference to the Camden Society, but to the lovers of Church architecture generally, among whom the notion that Gothic is the only Christian style has very considerable prevalence, we propose now to follow up the inquiry we began in March. We repeat, that we then showed how groundless are the claims of any one style, if by Christian architecture be meant that which has been always used in the Christian Church. But there is a totally different sense in which the phrase may be used, and a claim put in for pointed Gothic, to which we did not then refer, but on which we now mean to pause for a while, and see if it casts any new light on the subject.

Putting, then, out of the question the mere fact of use by the Christian Church, it may be asserted, (and with truth,) that pointed Gothic is the Christian architecture in this sense, that it is the birth of the Christian mind, and the only architecture, according to the highest use of the word, that is so. Perhaps, indeed, Egyptian, pure Grecian, and pointed Gothic, are the only fully and consistently developed styles in which the art has, through different manifestations, its entire fulfilment. Roman architecture, we need hardly tell our readers, is not harmonious and consistent art. It availed itself of Grecian details, while it violated their essential relations, and introduced a new and incongruous feature—the arch. The proportions of column and entablature imply and have reference to a particular inter-columniation and range, and therefore the former become meaningless when separated from the latter. The same remark applies to the daughter style, the Italian revived classical. There, too, we have the Grecian features detached from their needful context; cornices in the interiors, where the original purpose of a cornice can have no scope; columns with no reference to inter-columniation; and other adaptations, to which long use, and a sense of their happy general effect in skilful hands, have reconciled us, but which would probably make an ancient Athenian faint, could he see them. Nor is the Romanesque, in any one of its varieties, a consistent and harmonious architecture. Though outraged more and more by each successive stage of invention and adaptation, the classical idea of the vertical column supporting the horizontal line haunted it to the last; and grand and impressive as its results finally became, and loudly and clearly prophetic as they were of the coming glories of pointed Gothic, we feel amid them all, that we have but a transition style,

and that the absolute harmony and consistency of the whole composition is something which we have yet to wait for.

Now this harmony and consistency we have in pointed Gothic, just as we have it in pure Grecian ; and therefore the one is the Christian, and the other the Pagan architecture. Our exclusion of Roman, Romanesque, and Italian classical from this dignity proceeds, it will be seen, from reasons different from those of Mr. Pugin and the Camden Society. With us they are tried not on the question of Christian or Pagan, but of architecture in the highest sense, and no architecture. And in this sense we give it against them. That harmony and perfection which are required in art, are only to be found, we repeat, among European architectures in pure Grecian and pointed Gothic. In them only do we find their different ideas perfectly brought out,—in them only does each member take up a position which is at once its own, and yet absolutely required for it by all the rest,—in them only is nothing meaningless,—nothing, the real use of which must be ignored or forgotten before we can avoid regarding it as a disfigurement. In Grecian, the long range of columns, each standing at an interval from the other bearing a strict and beautiful relation to their common shape and proportions,—the clear and uninterrupted horizontal line which they support,—the sharp-cut, deep-shadowing cornice,—the absence of break in front, side, or angle,—the meaning and propriety of the whole,—realize to us a particular perfection—the only perfection that could then and there be attained—the perfection of earthly and earth-bound beauty. In pointed Gothic, the consistent aspiring of every part,—the soaring lines which end in no horizontal interruption, but in vaults typifying heaven,—where they are not broken nor lost, but find and assert their whole meaning from first to last, and are bound, as it were, in the repose they sought,—the connexion between the highest point of the vaulting and the floor,—the *rhyming* of pier, window, and vaulting arches,—the elastic life into which stone was now, by a quickening miracle, to start, displayed in groining ribs and window tracery,—and the consistency of every little bunch of carving with the great general idea of vertical extension,—these combine to render Gothic the other architecture—the great Christian counterpoise to the Grecian development. If this is what Mr. Pugin and the Camdenians mean by calling Gothic Christian architecture, we fully concede to them the phrase, and are prepared to maintain, along with them, that in this high sense of the word architecture, it is the only Christian one the world has yet seen, though we are not prepared to add that it is the only Christian one the world is destined to see.

But can we go along with them in their deduction, that it is the architecture we ought at present to employ ? To establish this, something more must be proved than what we have already laid down. A question of some practical importance arises. Can we use it ? We can imitate much of it, no doubt, but can we realize that perfection of it, of which we have been speaking ? Mr. Pugin and the Camden

Society have no difficulties, because we think they have an inadequate sense of this perfection. We do not recognise Gothic as architecture in the high sense in which we have been using the word, except it have all its distinctive features, including that most necessary one, a vaulted roof. Now will the Camden Society engage to furnish us always with this? Even then, we shall not perhaps have done with our difficulties and objections; but let us see how they will meet this our first demand. Turn to their review of Mr. Petit in the *Ecclesiologist*. He makes a similar one; having pronounced vaulting to be "nearly" (we say *quite*) "indispensable in the early pointed styles;" to which his critic thus responds:—

"And so far from Early-English or Decorated churches requiring vaulting, which the author, in p. 171, pronounces 'nearly indispensable,' very few of even our larger parish churches in those styles will be found ever to have had them; and nothing can be plainer or better adapted (since plainness, it seems, is to be the principal object,) for modern imitation than many of our Decorated country churches."—*Ecclesiologist*, p. 97.

There is no denying the fact here asserted; but its force, as a reason, remains we think to be shown. And this brings us to the real question,—Where are we to look for the ideas and principles of Gothic architecture? Mr. Pugin and his disciples have never, for one moment, doubted that they are to be found in all the churches of England, built during the great Gothic periods, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Even the humblest parish church of such dates is, with them, authority and precedent for whatever feature belonged to its original design. Now, we respectfully submit that all this requires proof. We see no reason to think that the designers and builders of our country churches would have been otherwise than much astonished, had it been foretold to them that a time should come when their works were to be quoted as authority. They did, beyond all doubt, the best they could; they and their employers have left behind them proofs that they acted in a widely different spirit (and a far better one) from that displayed by the church-builders of the present day—proofs, too, that they were aided by a far more intimate and powerful presence of genius and taste. But again we say, that we see no sort of reason to believe that they regarded themselves, or dreamt of others regarding their works in country villages, in the light of perfect works of art, and of as much authority as precedents, as perfect in their kind, as cathedrals and minsters. On the contrary, we are persuaded that their most self-congratulatory feelings concerning them often amounted to no more than viewing them as very happy *botches*.

The truth is, that our country churches are aided in the impression they now make by many circumstances, more or less independent of success in point of art: their antiquity, their situations, their distance from ourselves and our ways, which last circumstance makes it impossible for us to discern vulgarity in the most utter rudeness, even supposing it to have ever existed; all these most rightfully tell in their favour.

Our last supposition was professedly but hypothetical, and therefore we may well add, as causes of their attraction, in perfect consistency with what we have already said, the genius of their designers, and the wealth displayed on them, both of which may well humble us. But yet we maintain that they are in no way perfect works of art—that they are not good types of Gothic,—that if we looked merely to them, we should not be able to discover fixed principles, and a true harmony in Gothic. The wooden roofs are to our minds satisfactory on this point, for they violate the first principle of Gothic by cutting vertical lines,* which must end indeed, but which can end harmoniously only in vaulting. True, the Camden Society can probably point to very rich churches in which they occur, and in which, perhaps, vaulting could have been afforded had it been wished for; but unless they can prove that in those ages taste was never imperfect, that men did not get reconciled, as we have done, to wooden roofs from custom and from the skill and beauty displayed in them, the argument must, we think, go for nothing. Looking at them, not with an eye to the sanction of usage or precedent, but to the great principles of the architecture in which we find them, we pronounce them anomalies, in which, doubtless, we have all learnt to take pleasure just as we have learned to take pleasure in an Italian interior, with columns widely detached—with cornices, (a feature which has no propriety except in the exterior,) and with many other circumstances, all of which are anomalies also.

Neither can we understand how, it may be, three very short piers, supporting arches greatly higher than themselves, and of unequal width, (a sight which is to be seen in country churches,) can be in good proportion; unless we are to look upon all their monuments with an antecedent conviction that the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries never went wrong,—a proposition too crude and shapeless for our swallowing.

But a further argument in favour of our proposition, that our country churches are not models, will be found in the phenomena presented by decorated Gothic. This is generally considered the perfection of the style; and it is in this we think that the difference between what we count the true models, the churches with vaulted roofs, and the village churches, will be found widest and most apparent. In fact, we have sometimes been compelled to own to ourselves, that country specimens, in this style, were positively ugly. We know the shrug of compassion which this avowal may call forth, but we think there will be found some candid enough to join us in it, whose opinions are entitled to no little weight.

If, then, our country churches must be reduced to the level of all buildings, of which the design is not really architecture in its highest sense, are we bound to copy them at the expense of much practical

* Mr. Pugin's attempt at Derby to combine his wooden roof with the vertical lines, which must be the leading feature of all true Gothic, serves, we think, only to call attention to the proposition in the text, not in the least to remedy the defect.

inconvenience and difficulty? We cannot be, by the laws of art; we cannot be, by that principle of reverence which would lead us to come as near as we can to perfection, in the very humblest temple we raise to the honour and service of Almighty God, for we have found that our country churches possess no such perfection. But if we cannot be thus bound by considerations of this sort, we may perhaps be, by patriotism, which tells us, that pointed Gothic is English, and other styles foreign; and by that law of art, which encourages us to continue in the line that is tried, familiar, and instinctive; rather than to choose others to which we have no natural bias, and in which we cannot feel at home; and lastly, we may be told of the peculiarities of climate. Hear the Camden Society again:

"We regard all attempts to introduce 'entirely new styles' for church-building with the greatest suspicion—nay, with entire belief in the certainty of their failure. For first, a new style is *unnecessary*; we are already in possession of models most perfectly adapted to our purposes, if we avoid the indulgence of extravagant caprice and fancy in applying them; secondly, we should naturally prefer the style which the Christian Church in England has made peculiarly its own; thirdly, we ought to follow examples acknowledged by all to be of perfect beauty, and for imitating which we have the greatest possible facilities; fourthly, we must take into consideration the peculiarities of climate; fifthly, by giving unlimited license to architects and builders of all classes and capacities to vie with each other in 'maturing' these new-fangled semi-paganisms, we are sure to introduce every possible solecism and absurdity of which architecture is susceptible, and what is worse than all, to extinguish utterly the reviving love for the ancient forms, appurtenances, and decorations of Christian worship; lastly, both the Italian and Grecian styles have been attempted for the last two centuries in England, yet surely they have ever been found singularly inapplicable to ecclesiastical edifices."—*Ecclesiologist*, Pp. 97, 98.

In regard to the two first points, we cannot ignore or forget the facts, that England has now naturalized and used other styles for a period about as long as the reign of really good Gothic; that if the inhabitants of whole districts—the metropolis for example—are to be told to build in the style most instinctive to them, they must be in a state of utter bewilderment; and if in the style in which they find their best and most impressive churches, they must betake themselves to the Italian of Sir C. Wren; lastly, that nowherè does it come very naturally to us to build in what can be recognised as genuine pointed Gothic. The advice might have had weight three centuries ago, but after having filled the land with buildings of all shades of merit and demerit, in every variety of style, it is too late to go back to a particular one and say, "This is our vernacular, we are under constraint when we build Grecian or Italian, but here we are ourselves." Is it not in analogy with the whole modern character of England, with her enlarged commerce, and her enlarged knowledge, with the genius of her literature and her language, that she should be capable of adopting every thing really excellent in architecture, which suits her aim and can answer her purpose? Finally, we admit that "we must

take into consideration the peculiarities of climate," though the phrase is one which is apt to be used somewhat vaguely in reference to architecture. The diversities of climate require more attention in domestic than in public architecture, more in secular than in ecclesiastical, which latter is not to make too much either of comforts or discomforts. At the same time, if any one feature in Streatham Church, can be pointed out as incongruous *for a Church* in our climate, we can answer for the architect, who, like all people of real genius, is a man of strong sense also, taking note of the defect, and avoiding it in future. The architecture, too, not being of a very fixed character, will readily admit of whatever modification may be necessary on this score.

But if we have denied architectural consistency to our old country churches, we have already done so equally to every thing Italian or Romanesque. Why then, among styles, all of which are defective, do you exhort us to choose the last? Now, properly speaking, we have been making no exhortation of the sort, for the whole aim of this article has been to dissuade from bigotry, in favour of, or against, any one style. But we have no hesitation in repeating our former recommendation of the Romanesque of the south of Europe. No doubt, it is but a transition style; but from that very cause it is a creative one; and it is, we think, to some future, and as yet scarcely imagined development of Church Architecture, brought into being by the wants and the feelings of the age that shall produce it, that we are to look; and not to a mere repetition, even if such were possible, of the beautiful past. This is the only healthful, because the only living state of art. Copying our old buildings, however successfully achieved, is no more a progress of architecture, than making drawings or models of them.

Now Romanesque, as we have said, is a creative style. In its course, it issued once in pointed Gothic; but who can say that in that birth its capacities were exhausted? Who can say that if its materials of architecture (for of such it consists, rather than a formed and independent style,) be used reverently and with thought, we may not be led into some perfect and harmonious style of which we now dream as little as the designers of the old basilicas could have done of Amiens or Westminster?

Such anticipations seem to us in no degree extravagant; but even if they be, strong arguments remain in favour of Southern Romanesque, stronger than can be found, we think, for its northern sister, usually styled Norman. We can, as we have argued on a former occasion, build in this style, with an entire adaptation to our modern aims and demands in a church. This is a consideration which the Camden Society, and those who think like its members, treat with sublime contempt. But, undeterred by their scorn, we honestly proclaim our inability to forget the ways and the circumstances around us. We feel our reverence for a new church considerably strengthened by being assured that neither coxcombry nor pedantry

could have had much hand in its formation; that its designers, whatever scope they may have given to their taste and genius, have had their minds mainly fixed on the main object of the building, as to be realized, not by imaginary worshippers in the thirteenth, but by the immortal and hungering souls around them in the nineteenth century. We never can believe it to be in the true spirit of artists, and least of all of religious artists, to shut their eyes to the facts of a case. Now one fact about churches at present which we think an architect of real genius and earnestness will look in the face like a man, and steadily act upon, and bring all the resources of his intellect to bear upon, is, that, for the purposes of our present worship, we must have a hall capable of holding several hundred persons, in every part and corner of which one human voice can be heard. This, we suppose, the writers in the *Ecclesiologist* will call utilitarianism. Be it so; it is utilitarianism which we have no wish to discourage. Now a good church architect will design with a reference to the wants of the Church; and supposing such reference to be successfully made by him, those who are dissatisfied with the result must blame those wants, and not the architect. Let then our architectural antiquarians, who would have us build after the manner of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, prove to us that we ought to worship after the manner of those centuries. Here, indeed, Mr. Pugin has no difficulties, for this is just what he thinks: and did he belong to the true Church of England, we should have good hopes of his applying the same shrewd sense to the question of using pointed Gothic for the purposes of our Reformed worship, which he has applied to the question of using Grecian for the purposes of Christian worship in general. The Camdenians, therefore, are followers of Mr. Pugin only in part, for they are constrained to diverge from him at the very point where his path becomes somewhat consistent and reasonable. That a large Gothic church, built as he and they would have it, with a nave, and a chancel one half the length of the nave, or nearly so, is not one which answers the great condition we have just laid down, is obvious at a glance. Under such circumstances, the voice is sure to be lost somewhere, either from the pulpit or the altar; very probably from both.

Indeed, such a disposition of parts could never have arisen except under a various and multifarious ritual, of which the different rites were performed in different places of the building. Believing, as we do, that all genuine and living art must be a mirror of the state of affairs which produced it, we must believe mediæval church architecture to be a faithful representative of mediæval worship; and in consequence we must feel that there is an antecedent improbability in the notion of its being fit for ours. The piers, pier-arches, and side aisles, must have been well adjusted to rites which admitted and encouraged a plurality of altars, at each of which the Christian sacrifice might be offered before a group detached from any others who might be in the church. The length of nave and chancel together was a feature appropriate to processions; while the number of recesses,

each amounting to a separate chapel, suited, as we have said, the plurality of altars, the rite of confession, and the various observances which might concern certain parties, without bearing on the whole congregation. Now we have no processions,* admit of but one altar, can with propriety have but one service going on at the same time, and for the most part do nothing in church in which the whole congregation are not supposed to join; consequently the very features which were adjusted to the ways of our forefathers, are inconveniences to us.

We have alluded to the altar; and as this is the most solemn and distinctive feature of a church, as it is here that the paramount rite of the Gospel is performed, so we think it is with a reference to this that all our church architecture and arrangements should be carried out. Confessedly the misdirections of protestantism have tended to obscure its prominence; confessedly the due celebration of the Eucharist by priest and people alike, is an object which we have often great difficulty in attaining; and among subordinate causes of this difficulty, none is more frequent and more powerful than the architecture and fittings of our churches. To this subject, therefore, an architect animated by church sentiments will give his most earnest attention. He will be principally at pains to bring out the altar so as to give it its due prominence, to place the congregation in undisturbed sight of it, and of the great rite by which it is distinguished and hallowed,—a rite, each detail of which was intended to be seen by all who are to partake of it. He will arrange that the worshippers not merely have free access to the holy table to receive the consecrated elements, but also that they be able to see their solemn consecration.† Knowing that this object is not sufficiently present to their minds, he will endeavour so to dispose matter, that it may be suggested to them; and for this purpose, he will, we think, find himself almost under a necessity of departing from a servile submission to all the arrangements of the fourteenth century.‡ Nor must it be forgotten that there is one resource to which too little attention seems to have been paid, and by which the solemnity of the altar will be wonderfully increased: let the altar be elevated; height will do more than distance. We are not praising the particular *rere-dos*, which is very bad, nor recommending for

* The procession at the consecration of a church excepted, which exception surely can hardly invalidate our remark.

† The rubrics affixed to the prayer of consecration, plainly show the intention of our Church to be, that the mystic rite, in its social details, should be *seen* by the congregation. The mistake, therefore, is great, however pious the feeling from which it arises, which leads the congregation to bury their faces in their hands during that prayer.

‡ He will not be led under any circumstances to discard the chancel, or what shall be tantamount to a chancel, or at least, he will secure an apse, which shall answer the conditions which we require, but he will so contract the chancel, that under no circumstances it shall exceed, if it ever quite reach, one-third the length of the nave.

imitation the means by which it is achieved ; but who can forget the sublimity of the altar at Canterbury ?

The Camden Society may ask with horror, in their review of Mr. Petit, from which we have previously quoted,

“ Is there then no use in a chancel, reverence for which has been enjoined even by an œcumenical council ? Are we to unlearn our greater respect for that more hallowed part of a church, taught us as it has been by the authority of our greatest bishops ? ”—P. 100.

To which we reply : our objection lies not against chancels, their use, or the reverence for them, but against such chancels as shall *now* be useless ; so that we may well pass over another observation which they make, and which to us is altogether irrelevant :

“ Mr. Petit continues, in page 55, ‘ a chancel of inadequate width and projection, standing in a large gable, is poor and meagre in the extreme. It is better omitted altogether. ’ We can only hope that the last recommendation may never find its way to modern church-building committees. ”—P. 102.

It will be remembered that in addition to their incessant preaching of the necessity for what is called a church, the Camden Society have declared that a rood screen is “ a catholic appendage to a church which should never be found wanting. ”

To all this we reply, that the meaning and not the mere form of a chancel is what we wish to have. The part of our old churches which bears that name has ceased to deserve it, and as used at present, no longer can claim the decree of “ an œcumenical council ” as a reason why it should be peculiarly revered. The law which devolves on the rector the task of repairing it, is but a memento of its former dignity and solemnity ; but in public worship it has little or no practical separation (where it has not a great deal too much) from the rest of the building. It contains pews or benches for lay persons not occupied more than others with the service of the sanctuary. The vestry for the most part opens into it, so that for registering and other semi-secular purposes, it is often more crossed and recrossed than any other part of the church. And finally, and chiefly, it very generally has the effect of concealing the great rite of which it is the scene, of hindering the people from seeing the consecration of the eucharist.

That a chancel of this sort was not the chancel “ reverence for which has been enjoined even by an œcumenical council, ” we need hardly say. The chancel of those days was in a style, the merits of which the writers in the *Ecclesiologist* seem unable to appreciate. A gigantic semi-circular niche (the original apse) over-canopied an altar placed not against the wall, but in the chord of the arc ; and in the semi-circle sat the bishop and presbyters, with the deacons standing before them. The officiating priest stood facing the people, with the holy table between him and them, exactly as may be seen in any basilica at the present day. Who does not see that a chancel of this sort, however separated and peculiarly hallowed, hid none of the christian mysteries from the people, set them at no distance from the

sanctuary and the altar;* and that its real successor in modern churches etymologically, as well as practically, is the space within the altar rails? In a theological point of view, every church has a chancel that does not comply with the Camden Society's recommendation, and dispense with altar rails.† The elongated chancel of our old churches presumed, we suppose, a body of ecclesiastics sufficient to constitute a choir, and probably often pacing up and down its length, as may be seen in France at this day.‡

The effect, too, of Romish corruption, was to separate the people from the sacrifice, and entrust its celebration to the clergy and their acolyths. Surely now that we have learned more primitive sentiments on this subject, we need not court what can hardly prove other than a hindrance to carrying them out in practice. The Camdenians may perhaps be ready to prescribe some ritual changes, by which this inconvenience may be obviated. But the changes should be secured before we build churches which must be unsuitable without them. And as they cannot be made by church builders, and as the work of church building is one which cannot at present brook either interruption or delay, we see nothing for it but to look at the facts around us, and do the best we can in reference to them. We cannot well carry the point of moving a London congregation, at the fitting time, from our nave, in which they had in the first instance placed themselves, to our chancel. It is not within the scope of antiquarians to change habit and usage of this sort. But we can, we think, so build as to solemnize Christians by the sight of a solemn and conspicuous altar, with no intervening obstruction to their view of the great services performed thereat; and to this end, at once desirable and practicable, we would have architects apply themselves. It may be said that the proportions of our old churches require their chancels. Many feel that the proportions which we have suggested are better.

Our remarks can scarcely, we think, be so misconceived as to be interpreted into a discouragement of the study of Gothic architecture. Whether or not we are to attempt building in that style, we believe that its monuments constitute a field of research to which little else

* Of course we are speaking of the Latin Church, which never adopted the Sanctuary, into which the Oriental priest retires to consecrate the elements.

† See "Hints to Church Builders."

‡ Let us have such chancels, if we must have them, as will accommodate a tolerable number of clergy, with sedilia proportioned to those who may be expected to attend on solemn and extraordinary occasions, and these ranging north and south, (not two abominable chairs, for the clergy to stare at the people and to be stared at by them,) with accommodation, if it may be, for a surpliced choir, which we trust yet to see restored, and there will be few disputes between us and the Cambridge Society. We insist, as in the earlier apses, for some space for the clergy, for the present practice is bad in two ways: 1st, the clergy, who are not saying the public service at the desk, ought not to lean on or at the altar, as they do during the prayers; the altar ought to be restricted to the Eucharistic office: and, 2d, they ought to have sufficient accommodation for their own devotions, so as not to be distracted by the congregation, which more or less they must be, when placed in the very centre of the church, one on each side of the altar.

in art can bear comparison either for interest or importance; and that to study its great principles deeply and dutifully, is to bring oneself in contact with a high and profound beauty, not to be met with elsewhere. Neither do we commit ourselves to the declaration that Gothic cannot be successfully used in modern churches. So true, so living is that style, that he would be a rash man who felt sure that its capacities were exhausted, or that new combinations of it were impossible. All that we deprecate is, in the first place, such an idolatry of it, as debars us from using methods much more appropriate to our case, and much more likely, if one may look to the future, to come to some good issue, than that of merely copying the works of our forefathers; and secondly, such mere copying, involving, as it does, the adoption of forms and arrangements which had a meaning and a suitableness once, but have none now, and must, for the most part, act as hindrances to those great paramount aims which church builders ought to keep before them. A few of our more utilitarian remarks may incur the obloquy to which utilitarianism transgressing its province must always expose itself—that of being conceived in a low tone. But to establish the justice of such obloquy, the one question in regard to any piece of utilitarianism must always be, whether or not it does transgress its province. We have not meant our discourse to be directed against imagination, reverence, and unworldliness in the designing and building of temples to the honour of Almighty God. So far has our scope been from this, that we honestly believe these things likely to be promoted by church builders entering into and acting upon our suggestions.

Let us look at the facts of the case. Let us take some church in no way advantageous to our argument, built with as little attention either to antiquarian taste or architectural propriety as can well be imagined. According to its anathematizers, a person ignorant of the purpose for which it exists, would find, on entering it, no indication of such purpose having any connexion with dignity or solemnity. Now let us see what, nearly at the worst, would meet his eye. He would find himself in a spacious hall, a circumstance which must always be so far impressive that the purpose of the building is thereby indicated as public and general, not private or individual. In this case he finds, in addition, that the area in which he stands, enclosed as it obviously is to contain a vast number of persons, shows by its furniture and arrangement that it is not for any purpose of mere pleasure that they are to be assembled within it. The desk and pulpit, however unsightly they may contrive to be, attest some didactic end in view. But, out of taste as they too frequently are, they are in general a degree more costly than would be required or wished for, were the place a mere hall of science, and the instruction confined to secular learning of any sort. Such a supposition is altogether negatived by the altar, which at once marks the place for a temple, and indicates that, besides didactic, there are other and mystical purposes to which it is dedicated.

Now if a church, calculated for the uses of the present Church of England, does thus, even if in the worst possible taste, combine so many circumstances of intrinsic solemnity, such as must strike even an ignorant spectator, surely there is no member of the Camden Society which will say that the solemnity must not be, and ought not to be, greater to a man who knows the uses of the whole; who knows the high reconciling purpose in fulfilment of which so many are brought together—even that, while many, they may become one in Christ Jesus; who knows of what a full unclouded prophetic dispensation the didactic furniture of the building constitutes the material indications and organs, and by what an ineffable mystery of spiritual life and fellowship the altar is consecrated and glorified. And if all this be so,—if the mere hall be thus rendered solemn and awful by reason of its necessary appearance, and the furniture we are obliged to put in it,—it seems strange to say that we cannot, by a reference to certain features, and the adoption of proportions in themselves striking and impressive, (as who that has seen the Romanesque of Italy will deny that they are?) enhance this solemnity, and minister to it by the beauty both of outline and decoration. It seems strange to say that we can hope to produce no true or appropriate effect whatever, except by working after a by-gone model, which makes no account of our present wants or rites.

Finally, though we have thus differed freely from the opinions expressed by the Camden Society, we would not be thought insensible to the zeal of its operations, and the services it has in consequence rendered. Very much good indeed has it been permitted to achieve. Elsewhere we have alluded to its successful assault on pews; and in every part of the country we see restorations and additions, for which without it we might have waited long; and, better than all, the revised Instructions of the Church Building Society may be attributed, at least indirectly, to its influence. We part from the Society, we trust, gracefully; and, convinced of the possibility of a change of views, and, may we add? of a deeper insight into God's *present* dealings with our Church occurring even to some of its leading members, we rejoice, meanwhile, in thinking that, as they and we have a common end in view, hereafter we may be permitted to prosecute it by common means.

Truth without Prejudice. Pp. 155. Rivingtons. 1842.

"*TRUTH without Prejudice*" is rather a startling title, calculated to raise a suspicion that the whole book is a tissue of boldness not unmingled with presumption. These are not days when we may warrantably expect from any man, especially a writer, and more emphatically still, a religious writer, the expression of unbiassed truth;

multitudes of influences, external and internal, as various in force as endless in number, combine to prevent an individual's holding the simple truth unbiassed by any associated prejudice; our first impressions, therefore, were, that this book must be either extravagantly bad, or extraordinarily good. At the first glance, however, we were disposed to reject the former notion by the symptom of modesty exhibited in the concealment of the name of the writer. The absence of a Preface too, or other introductory flourish, inclined us to think well of the author, and believe in the earnestness and simplicity of his purpose. Nor was this feeling disturbed by any one portion of the contents of the book. The writer is evidently not only actuated by a deep, genuine, enlightened sense of religion, but further, possessing much knowledge of the workings of the heart, and all the way through addressing his reader with a gentleness, and sometimes a tenderness, almost feminine. Laying his hands at once upon those chords of the heart which vibrate the same note in all human beings, he gently, but irresistibly draws attention to the importance of his subject, and so inspires with confidence in his power to guide, that the will almost insensibly, but speedily, resigns itself to the spirit of truth and love breathed in the language of the writer.

No book can be adapted to the diversified and contrary states of feeling to which the human heart is exposed, but as it approaches in character to the universality of Holy Writ;—there is food for every want, and medicine for every disease of the soul,—and there only; but we feel that we do not ascribe too much value to this little volume, in attributing to it a degree of interest and utility far exceeding many others of much greater bulk and more sounding titles. The style has that freedom from ostentation and excitement which marks the sincere and enlightened Churchman; otherwise, there is so little sign of party or sect, of favour to one class of tenets or hostility to another, that the possibility of the thing is scarcely suggested to the reader, till he reaches the middle of the book, where he comes to the subject of the liturgies of our Church; and even here, though uttering no more than simple truth requires, he is so desirous not to be thought the advocate of partial views, that he makes some special observations upon the subject, which we cite, not merely as conveniently serving to introduce the author himself to our readers, but because they accurately describe a most important feature of the work:—

“As I am not writing for those whose attention or time is likely to be much engrossed by religious controversy, I have confined myself to what is positively of vital importance. The man of leisure and learning will sift these things to the bottom; but I have abstained from quoting proofs and authority, not because they were difficult to find or feeble in testimony, but because in this work I have only those before me who will profit more by a plain statement of unquestionable facts, than by the details of argument; added to which, the title of this volume compels me not only to seek to clear my own mind as much as possible from prejudice, but also to avoid (as far

as I can, consistently with truth) whatever might clash with the prejudices of others. I have therefore made no quotation but from the Bible or Prayer-Book; for however thankful I might have been for the effectual aid of writers far more able than myself, I could not have borrowed their words without running the risk of leading my readers to fancy that perhaps I agreed with the *whole* of whatever writings I referred to, or that I belong to a *party*. Whether this were true or not, I should at once have roused all the old associations and predispositions that might have existed in their minds, and thus, in *their* estimation, have forfeited all claim to writing "truth without prejudice."—P. 90, note.

The book is small, but there are so many passages which would amply justify our commendation, warm as it is, that choice is difficult. There are many instances—for the most part brief, of analysis of motives and exposure of delusive principles, which are given with a masterly hand. Take as an example the following remarks upon what is called

RESPECTABLE MORALITY.

"Now, no moral conduct can be sure which is separate from any religious principle. It is then based only upon public opinion, a mere natural sense of right and wrong, and the proverb that 'honesty is the best policy.' Should a temptation come (as it might do any day) of sufficient force to throw into the shade these self-supported motives, the whole fabric of a man's morality goes to the ground; there is nothing to fall back upon, no higher principle which the circumstances of time and the false appearances presented by temptation cannot touch, and therefore he falls a victim to his own natural passions, stirred up by some accidental incidents. This is the reason that we see so many persons go on for years apparently unexceptionable in their conduct, and then suddenly comes a moral bankruptcy, and all who knew them are astonished. It occurs most frequently in the lower ranks, because there, while the force of public opinion is less strong, the temptations are stronger. Why, then, should the world feel surprised, when some unhappy wretch, trusted and even beloved by those he served, turns out at last a thief and a murderer! He may not have been so all his life; he may have at one time really deserved the confidence reposed in him: but some strong trial comes to him, and it then appears by the result, of what class that man's morality must have been."—P. 31.

The fact of there being *no trifles in morals or religion*, is pointed out with much earnestness; and the disastrous consequences of levity in connexion with things sacred are impressively portrayed. Very few trouble themselves to reflect upon, and still fewer are either able or inclined to appreciate justly, the importance of each individual act in relation to the whole being; no notion perhaps is more generally received than that no single act can materially affect, either for good or for evil, the future character. Few but would laugh at the idea of a word, especially one uttered in joke or fun, exerting any lasting influence on the being of the utterer. Hence the readiness to excuse in others, as well as ourselves, almost any single act or word, and consequently, as years roll on, many such single acts and words. Hence many a violation of a law avowedly recognised as sacred, is committed and tolerated, if only it be done *not seriously*, but as a joke, merely to amuse those around us. The notion, however, is false, and mischievous as false; and the writer before us in more than

one place, endeavours to alarm his reader at an ever present danger, of which probably he was previously unaware.

"One light word," he says, "on religion, one light joke which ridicules the things and persons belonging to it, leaves a scar upon the mind, which time hardens. It is not true, as some would plead, that they can laugh outwardly, and feel respect inwardly; the latter must be always to a degree diminished by the indulgence of the former, and the mind which is not conscious of this at the very time that the jest is allowed, has scarcely enough left of reverential feeling to judge by."—P. 25.

And to sink to this level of unconsciousness is much more easy, and of more frequent occurrence, than we might at first be disposed to imagine. The downward progress commenced in disregarding the beginning of evil, is not rapid or abrupt. No: "He who despises little things, shall fall by little and little:" were the change the mind undergoes perceived, we should be startled and alarmed. The instances of sudden revolutions in character are very rare: ordinarily these results are the effect of minute modifications repeated in long succession; but they are not the less certain, whether for good or evil. The parish priest in his intercourse with his flock—indeed, every pious reflecting mind—is frequently no less astonished than shocked at the instances met with of unconsciousness of the moral law, or what our author terms *actual ignorance of what is wrong*, in persons in whom, on matters of business, or when their feelings are interested, no lack of sense or intelligence is discovered. This *actual ignorance*, however, chiefly consists in things which, because by comparison of minor importance, are therefore deemed of no importance at all. But it is unfortunately by the neglect of these so-called trivialities, that we are led to misappreciate greater things; and one peculiar excellence of the present little volume is, that it, with gentle but resolute firmness, exposes to view the true but unheeded sources of error and sin, to which may be referred many of the miseries of life, domestic, social, and political. The innocence of childhood is at all times an object, the contemplation of which inspires with awe; but to think of it as past and irrecoverable, is more awful still; and what our author's manner is in touching upon such points, may be seen in the following passage on

THE EFFECT OF SIN ON THE MIND.

"The mind that acts uprightly to God and its own conscience, according to the sense of right and wrong which it possesses, will grow more keenly alive to every duty, and more sensitive of every offence. There can be no doubt that clearness of conscience is the result of honest effort to do the best we can; and that, on the other hand, *actual ignorance* of what is wrong is most frequently (or always) the result of having deadened the moral feeling by continuance in sin. Indeed it is an awful thought how easily this may be done, and how difficult, even where not impossible, it is ever to restore the integrity of a much injured conscience. Though the wounds of sin may close again, yet the part is hardened and deadened; it can never return to the smooth soft flesh of a little child; it can never again be innocent, that is, ignorant; for it is the *practical knowledge* of sin which is the dreadful curse it leaves, and there are no waters of Lethe here."—P. 99.

But to enable our readers to judge of the general character of the book, we must make a few extracts from different parts. The subject of prayer is beautifully and most impressively handled.

PRAYER.

"The duty we will first consider is that of prayer, yet I hardly know how to urge it upon you. There are throughout Scripture promises to encourage you and warnings to impel; but unless you know the value and the comfort of it, you are hardly likely to commence it upon a mere speculation of its success; but if you look back upon your life, say to the hour of greatest agony you ever passed through, you prayed then. When your life has been on the brink of danger, and preserved, you thanked God then. When you have parted with one you cared for, you implored a blessing then. The words came easily to your lips; for a moment you felt that you were dependent, and weak, and unhappy, and that there was a Power above you, and to that Power you appealed. Now, as our poverty, our weakness, and our dependence remains the same, though no unusual event force them upon our recollection, and as, added to these, there is our perpetual liability to error, and our frequent actual commission of sin, ought not our prayers to be also constant? Day by day God's hand strengthens you; night by night his power protects you; should not day and night, then, be consecrated to Him?

"There are difficulties attending it, and they are not slight: our thoughts and our feelings have been cast in the mould of time and circumstance. On every side this world presses hard and close with a strong sense of reality; and however an exciting cause may occasionally raise us out of its influence, and lift us nearer to the world of spirits, it is often an exertion, I might almost say a painful and a wearisome one, to raise our souls from the crowd of actual things into communion with what is unseen at regular and stated periods. Yet since the Almighty Being who has a right to demand our services has especially demanded this, the effort will be acceptable in his sight, and I need not tell you will bring its own reward. The restraint upon the passions produced by constant prayer, the soothing effect in sorrow, the feeling of being thereby brought nearer to the Protector of our life, will act upon the daily habit of the mind as nought else can do. Do not, then, only pray when it is easy and pleasant to do so, but pray always. The very fact of disinclination may prove that temptation is at work, or that the present scene is asserting too strong a claim upon your attention and your affections. Added to which, though at that moment you may not be so keenly aware of your need of divine grace and blessing, it has not therefore decreased, but the contrary; you are not richer than when you owned your poverty; and will you, then, cease to apply to Him who alone can support you? More than that, will you only bring worship and service to your Creator and your Saviour, when it is pleasant and convenient to you to do so? Will not this be rather seeking yourself and not Him?

"Adopt, then, the habit of regular and constant prayer, and that too upon all subjects and circumstances of interest to you, though, of course, especially upon what relates to purity of heart and life. You may do this without fear, for to the divine and infinite mind how can there be any little or great in mere human affairs, any important or unimportant in his sight? By attempting any such division as this in the judgment of God, you exclude the truth that He embraces all, and fills all with his own infinity. Trust Him, then, with the whole, 'casting all your care upon him, for he careth for you,' and 'in all things with prayer and supplication let your requests be made known to God.'—P. 73.

* We dissent from the opinion expressed in this question. Our Saviour Himself makes a scale of importance in mundane affairs, as viewed by the Creator.

In another very interesting passage, which, though long, we cannot help laying before our readers, the writer shows how we may obtain an answer to Pilate's question, explains the historical value of the Apostles' Creed, and points out the distinction between trusting to the guidance of the Church,—or rather, receiving the Church as a guide, and committing our conscience to the government of the priest.

" TRUTH—THE CREED—THE PRAYER-BOOK—AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

" We need only look at the countless sects and parties which divide the Christian world, in order to feel how very uncertain even the purest heart and the strongest head must be in the search after truth, unless there be at hand some surer guide than the best of human understanding, guarded though that may be by the most pious intention. The question of Pilate, 'What is truth?' spoken in a thousand different tones, with as many different feelings, is still unceasingly asked; and when we see one after another taking up that mysterious book, finding therein the same mysterious glimpses at eternal verities, and each, after much sincerity of purpose, coming to various conclusions on important questions, and then erecting for themselves a new creed, and propagating these opinions amongst others, we cannot but anxiously look round for some more infallible test of divine truth than that which our individual minds are capable of. Anxious as I have been to avoid even allusion to the endless religious controversies of this day, I can hardly touch upon this subject, without appearing to glance at some of them. Had the Almighty Being provided us with no other guide in the study of Scripture than the force of our own reason assisted by prayer, we might have confidently followed that. It would then have been presumption to desire any other, or to suppose any could be necessary; but since He *has* given another, it is yet greater presumption to imagine we can do without it. He exacts nothing from us which He does not give us the means of obeying; and since He has required our belief of truth, He has doubtless somewhere or somehow made it plain what *is* truth, and given us some criterion by which, unless we are wilfully blind, we can know which of the hundred interpretations of the principal religious tenets must be the right one."

" Years elapsed from the death of our Saviour before any of the writings of the New Testament were composed, and, of course, years more before they were generally diffused. During that period the direct personal instructions of the apostles themselves in some instances, and the oral and traditional *repetitions* of these instructions in others, formed the 'gospel' of the early church. Previously, however, to any of the writings of the four Evangelists, that summary of doctrine, termed (and accurately termed) 'the Apostles' Creed,' was incontestably used in the church, as the universal baptismal formula or confession of faith required from candidates for baptism. It is therefore more ancient than any of the written doctrines of the New Testament, and it is unquestionably of pure apostolic origin. It must, then, throw some light upon the subsequent writings of these same apostles. It comes from the same pure source, and in date is nearer to the fountain-head. Now the words of belief required in the first times of the apostles, from those who sought admission into the Church, must doubtless be a correct *sketch*, as it were, of what the writings of those same apostles would afterwards teach in the Church. We should expect in this teaching to find no contradiction to these elementary principles, which were to form the groundwork of their faith; and where we might be in doubt as to the true intention of any subsequent documents coming from the same hands, we should employ this as the *test*, as that whereby we might define the limits of their meaning."

“ And now suppose that, in the after writings of these Apostles, difficulties arise which surpass the limits of this creed, and that questions start up which require a full explanation and comment, and which, if misunderstood, lie open, as all great truths do, to much abuse and danger. What would be the natural course to follow with respect to this, and how might we best hope to come to a plain sense of their meaning? Would it not appear that if, near to the time in which these obscure doctrines were first propounded in the Church, there had lived, as members of the same Church, great and holy men, who held an important place as teachers and guides; and that, if these men had written directly upon such doctrines, and handed down to us, not simply their own *private views* on the subject, but those interpretations which were then universally held by the members of the Church, and which they knew, either directly or indirectly, to have been *universally* held as the true interpretation *since the very first teaching of these same doctrines by the Apostles themselves in person*,—would it not appear, I say, that in the writings of these great men we shall get very near to the pure truth? Take another instance. Suppose that there appears to us great doubt upon any important doctrine, say that of justification, of election, of the value of good works, or any other such, and that by searching the writings of these primitive teachers, we discover that each one in their different works, different country, and different age, *all* agree in giving the same interpretation, would not the obvious conclusion be, that they had received it unbroken from the apostolic times, and that it was believed by universal consent throughout the pure Church? And when we find that in the same manner in which they all *uphold* one doctrine, they *condemn* another as false, and speak of heresies and heretics who have been separated from the pure body of the Church, should we not believe that this doctrine was not taught by the Apostles in the Church, and that therefore these men knew it to be recent and false, and that so it must be equally false in the present day?”

“ Now suppose that the branch of the Church to which you as an Englishman belong had gone on for centuries in close connexion with, and dependence upon, another branch of the Church which is at Rome; and at last, discovering that this latter had contracted in her practice many things which were not held in the early Church in the time of the Apostles and their immediate successors, but, on the contrary, were quite recent as compared with these, and that thereupon the portion of the Church in England determined to cut off from herself these false additions, and to return as nearly as she could to what was originally universally held. Suppose that, in order to accomplish this, her best men endeavoured, with great labour and care, to compile a book, the materials of which they sought for in the early documents or liturgies of the Church, as preserved in the writings of the fathers, and as many of them were still retained in the portion of the Church from which these men were anxious to separate themselves, and that in this book, though they may have failed to preserve all that they might have done, yet it can be proved that they added nothing of *their own*, nothing which they have not either directly taken from early usage, or entirely founded thereon. Surely, then, in this book we should find a safe compendium of authentic christian doctrine, a compilation of what the early Christians held to be, from the Apostles themselves, the right interpretation of those doctrines taught by those Apostles in Scripture. This book is the Common Prayer-Book. Can you, therefore, wonder, when I tell you that here you may find a safe guide in the study of Scripture; that in these beautiful liturgies and ordinances you may search for the true doctrines of the Church, and be safe there? And it would be impossible for any person of ordinary understanding to attend the services of the Church regularly bearing in mind the value of the Prayer-Book as a key to the

meaning of religious doctrines, without obtaining a clear practical view of all that is of most importance, unless, indeed, the mists of sin exclude all light from their minds."

"Thus the authority of the Church, as the only lawful expounder of Scripture with which the Almighty wisdom has sought to shelter his own Divine word, is disregarded and laid aside, and with head and heart full of arguments to prove the right of private judgment upon religious matters, (that is the right of every man to find out a private way of his own in which to believe and serve his Creator,) each one sits down with what he finds at hand, to pick out his road in the awful mysteries and hidden things of Divine truth! What wonder, then, that even in the professed members of the Church herself, we see such serious diversity of opinion! What wonder that thousands more leave her fold, and erect a sandy fabric of their own!

"He who has been 'tossed about with every wind of doctrine,' who has bent with anxious heart and aching head over the puzzled pages of modern theology, and in vain sought for a full satisfaction to the yearning thirst for an *entire truth* which burnt within him,—he who has felt that he must find it or perish, and has been agonized with the thought of what seemed the almost impossible command to search and follow truth,—who has listened in midnight silence to the dark riddle of the mysterious sphinx,—and heard her threatening voice in tones that deadened the loudest call of busy life,—alone knows what it is at last to take up his rest within the hallowed walls of the Church, laying aside all his long-sought and hardly-earned religious schemes and systems, to listen like a child to her simple teachings, and having bent his faith to her creed, to feel that it is now only left him with a quiet mind and a believing heart to mould his life to her instructions. With what a soothing calm do the deep cool shadows of those time-hallowed arches which echo to her constant voice, fall on the brow that has been heated with religious controversies.

"You will at once perceive the difference between thus yielding your faith to the testimony of universal and catholic agreement in the united body of the Church, in and near the apostolic ages, and the error of which the Romanists are accused, of committing their conscience to the government of their priests, and thus receiving his individual testimony as an infallible guide. Strange to say, many persons confound these two most opposite principles; and when we talk of submitting to the authority of the Church in all points of doctrine and practice, imagine that they are to be reduced to a priest-ridden people!"—P. 82—94.

Many other passages might be extracted of equal interest; but we hope that what we have already transferred to our pages will excite a desire to see the rest. How infinitely more powerful to enlarge and ennoble the mind, to form and guide the manners, whether of male or female, is such a book as this, than all the vile nonsense and mischievous trash of such writers as Mrs. Ellis and all of that school. Our surprise is really not unmixed with shame, to find that the ignorant folly of the world, or the selfish ingenuity of the publishers—or both together—have succeeded in carrying that worse than trumpery work, "The Women of England," through fifteen or sixteen editions. Here, however, is an antidote to the poison. Wherever this little volume, "Truth without Prejudice," is introduced, Mrs. Ellis and all her tribe will be put on the top shelf, or thrust into the dark closet.

The two last sections, on The Eucharist and the One Ruling Principle, are full of just reasoning and impressive counsel; but these

we are obliged to omit noticing, as well as several things we had marked for extraction, some of which are of considerable importance and suggestive power, especially one or two on the subject of the treatment of servants, and some very significant hints on the moral character of our present drama. The work comprehends in its narrow limits a great variety of topics, and we cannot but believe that it is from the hand of a master; and if the first, will soon be followed by other equally valuable productions.

The City of the Mormons; or Three Days at Nauvoo, in 1842.
By the REV. HENRY CASWALL, M. A., Author of "*America and the American Church*," and *Professor of Divinity in Kemper College, St. Louis, Missouri*. London. Rivingtons. 12mo. p. 82.

A YEAR or two ago, one Mr. George Combe published three volumes of Phrenological Notes, as he was pleased to call them, on the United States. This Mr. Combe, as far as we can make out, is a representative of the extreme liberal type in religion; in other words, he seems to be of no religion at all;—he would have phrased it, that he has no sectarian bias;—and to do these philosophers, as they call themselves, justice, they make a special point of insulting all forms of Christianity; though, as might be expected, their wildest vituperation is reserved for the Church Catholic. Be it so. Were she not receiving this sacred share in His sufferings, it might be thought that He were not with the Holy Bride! But we are told the Church is the enemy of education, because hitherto she teaches the catechism instead of the science of bumps and lumps; the Church cannot bear to see the public mind advancing in knowledge, because Mr. Combe's "*Moral Philosophy*" has not been introduced into our Sunday schools; the exclusive dominion over the soul, at which the Clergy aim, is inconsistent with true religious liberty; the "chains of bigotry and intolerance are riveted round the necks of the enthralled listeners," and so forth. What a land of horrors! But turn to the other hemisphere, and Cimmerian darkness is exchanged for the mid-day sun.

"In the United States the system of education" [against which the Scotch presbyterian community most properly petitioned] "has been in actual operation, and with the best effect, for years. The state provides, for *all* the people, secular education and instruction in those moral departments of Christianity in which all sects are agreed; and it leaves to parents and pastors the duty of indoctrinating the young in their own peculiar tenets. The state recognises no sect as wiser, or better, or sounder than the others, but leaves the people to judge of their merits, and to support them according to the dictates of their own consciences and understandings. The consequences are—extremely little religious animosity; churches supported by voluntary zeal so numerous, that in New England, and in the cities generally over the Union, there is one for every thousand inhabitants; and a clergy so industrious, that a large proportion of them actually sacrifice their

healths, and some their lives, in the discharge of their duties. The churches, moreover, are far more handsome and comfortable in their accommodations, and much better filled, than those of the Establishment. Meanwhile, the whole country is actively engaged in the work of education. It is no wonder, then, that the people of the United States look with wonder at the proceedings of our Established Clergy in regard to education."—*Combe*, vol. iii. pp. 33, 34.

Delightful! 13,000,000 of people and 12,000 churches (of course, "churches," all of them) Unitarian churches, Freethinkers' churches, Jumpers' churches, Shakers' churches, Quakers' churches! all full, all handsome, all comfortable!—(no doubt of this last condition)—12,000 ministers and more, all hard at work, and a goodly percentage worked to death every year; not starved to death, as some might fancy, from a little English experience of voluntarism,—but actually dying of preaching, evaporated by sermons, done to death by the warmth of their zeal, *bonâ fide* voluntary work in a voluntary church. And if we want to know a little more than these rough statistics, let us hear another worthy of the same liberal school, who favours us with particulars and lets us into the heart of this trans-atlantic ant-hill of theology teeming with life and labour.

"The churches of Boston are very numerous, and the changes that have taken place in the religious opinions of the clergy [!] and their congregations, are among the most remarkable that are to be found in any part of the United States. From the high degree of respect in which the character and office of a minister of religion is held here, Boston has been called 'the paradise of clergymen,' and from the number, wealth, and influence of the"—[Eh? what? our eyes deceive us surely—look again!] "of the Unitarian preachers and hearers here, it has been also called 'the headquarters of Unitarianism.' The number of places of worship in Boston, are [*sic*] about 70:

Unitarians	14	Universalists	6
Presbyterians	13	Roman Catholics	4
Baptists	8	Swedenborgians	1
Methodists	7	Quakers	1*
Episcopalians	6		

"Of the unitarian churches [!] the greater number were originally presbyterian or episcopalian,† and have since been occupied by unitarian ministers. The unitarian preachers are more eminent for learning and elo-

* The other ten seem to shift creeds, and are of that intractable kind which refuse classification, and admit of no definition. Mr. Buckingham speaks of them as not being "regularly open:" perhaps, like theatres, they have a religious season in Boston; or perhaps they are opened when the National Bank stops, and the Americans are flush of money, by not settling their debts with the English traders; or perhaps these ten will not pay.

† The affecting and awful history of one of these changes is subsequently detailed. King's Chapel was the first church built in New England, originally in 1689; it was twice rebuilt, and finally, in 1756, at a great expense: the organ was selected by Handel. Queen Mary, Queen Anne, and King George, were benefactors to it to the amount of 2,800 ounces of plate; and yet this very church, patronized by bishops, and thus gifted by sovereigns, was the first to renounce the Saviour. After the revolution an amended liturgy was introduced by Dr. Parker, "according to the alterations made by the celebrated English divine, Dr. Clarke; these changes being chiefly the rejection of the Athanasian creed, and the omission of all the passages that either recognised or adverted to the doctrine of the Trinity." Mr. Buckingham is guilty of the extreme absurdity of characterizing this desecrated place as recognising

quence than the ministers of any other sect; and their congregations embrace nearly all the most wealthy and influential families of the city. The universalists are also yearly increasing. The handsomest steeple in Boston is that of the Federal Street Church, where the celebrated Dr. Channing, the unitarian preacher, officiates. West Church is one of the few in Boston which stands apart from all sects. Its members adopt no other name than Christians. It professes no particular creed, but acknowledges the Scriptures, in the light in which each devout member of the church may regard it, as the only rule of faith and practice. The Pitts Street Chapel obtains the services of Christian ministers of every denomination in turn, to give free religious instruction to the poor."—*J. S. Buckingham's America*, vol. iii. p. 342, *et seq.*

More delightful still! if the United States be the Greece of Voluntaryism, Boston is its Athens, for in Mr. Buckingham's rapturous summing up of the whole—

"All are conducted on the voluntary system, without the least aid, either in patronage or pay, from the state; and in no city in the world are the clergy better provided for, the churches more commodious and comfortable, the congregations more numerous, or the harmony and friendly feeling between the different sects more remarkable than here."—*J. S. Buckingham's America*, vol. iii. p. 344.

And though some may think it a slight drawback that in no city of the world is Socinianism more general, yet the causes of the spread of heresy in this earthly "paradise of clergymen," are shrewdly enough detailed.

"With whatever religion men begin life, when they grow rich, they become unitarians, in Boston; first, because they feel themselves relieved from a great deal of the troublesome duty of attending prayer-meetings, private conferences, confessions of experience, and other searching and disagreeable inquisitions, from which, the moment they become unitarians, they are free; secondly, because, whatever may be their peculiar views of religion, as to its mysteries and doctrines, they are unrestrained in the fullest indulgence of them, without being chargeable with heresy; as independence of judgment is allowed to all, without injury or responsibility."—*J. S. Buckingham's America*, vol. iii. pp. 450, 451.

In other words, Unitarianism is the creed of the self-indulgent, the worldly, the profane, and the liberal; and when we are told of the austerities of fasting, and of the "will-worship" of the daily service, and of the uncharitableness of an exclusive creed, let such objectors ask themselves whether Unitarianism is not the consistent result of their own principles?

The whole thing has had a fair field in the United States, and its fullest development in the city of "the Pilgrim Fathers," (traitors and heretics, by the way, to a man,) and yet in Boston nearly one-half of the so-styled churches are held by Unitarians; for in America, as in England,* Presbyterianism is only another name for

"royalty in its name, episcopacy in its ritual, and unitarianism in its doctrine." God forbid that there should be the slightest affinity between what he calls "episcopacy," meaning the doctrine of the Church, and the mangled and blasphemous prayer-book of King's Chapel, Boston!

* "Nearly every congregation of Presbyterian foundation in England has arrived at Unitarian views through adoption of the same principles."—*Address from a Body of Socinians*, 1842, quoted in "Plain Words to Plain People." p. 22.

Socinianism *in transitu*. In Boston, the most polished, quiet, respectable, learned place in the Union,—almost all the “wealthy and influential,” such as Mr. Webster, for example, deny the doctrines of the Trinity and Atonement; and they take pride in proclaiming, that (to use their own detestable jargon) they are “neither Trinitarians nor Satisfactionists.”

One would think that he who runs could read this. The country of the United States was peopled by the outcasts of society—awful warning this of the possible fate of our other plantations!—Puritans, fifth-monarchy-men, rebels, the broken in fortune, the loose in creeds, and the loose in practice, found a common refuge in this the *sentina reipublicæ*, this the *collurio gentium*: schism was patronized and fostered; the Church struggled on as it could without episcopal authority, a headless body, subject to every evil influence of politics and oppression; the Arian tendencies of our English Hoadleys and Clarkes and Blackburnes were unchecked; and in the partial apostasies, at home, of such men as Linsey and Belsham, we can too well understand the sad history of King’s Chapel, Boston, and of the other congregations which exchanged our Catholic services for the cold deformities of Socinianism.

Where there are no bishops and no discipline to feed and trim the sacred flame, the candlestick of a church is only not “removed out of his place;” and in this instructive, yet fearful fact, we can readily account for the universal spread of Socinianism, without reckoning the other important leaven of insurrectionary successes.

It requires but little change to adapt the celebrated lines to that dread truth which we are now called upon to witness and to describe.

“Westward the course of *error* takes its *flight*;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the *night*;
Schism’s blackest offspring is the last.”

And tremendous indeed is the last offspring of religious freedom in “the far west.” Socinianism itself is only a state of change; it may seem the final term in the long descent of heresy; but hell is so fruitful in wickedness, that we can never tell what monstrous forms of evil remain to be developed under the genial influences of a vaunted liberty in creeds. Every thing seems gigantic in the valleys of the Mississippi and the Missouri; but the Mastodon and the Megatherium of a guilty world are not more awful instances of God’s wrath upon these fruitful valleys, than is Mormonism* a sign of the empire of Satan over the corrupt mind and will of man.

We all remember with what a tumult of horror the existence of Socialism in our towns and villages was proclaimed; but we are now called upon to be witnesses, some of our readers haply in the case of their own parishioners, of Englishmen by thousands deserting the land of their birth and the Church of God, to ally themselves to a

* What a significant name! We know not whence it originated, but our readers will remember that Hesychius describes *αοομῶν*—*μορμῶνες*, as “wandering demons.”

new religion, to enlist themselves under the banners of a new prophet, whose imposture seems as likely to prevail as that of Mahomet, to accept a new creed and a new revelation contained in "the Book of Mormon," to renounce their baptism, and to flock to Nauvoo, the city of the "latter-day saints," a wild place in the unsettled state of Missouri, two hundred and thirty miles from the conflux of the Missouri and Mississippi, fifteen hundred miles north of New Orleans, and two thousand miles west of New York, in the very centre of the western continent : or if not this, to cherish its doctrines, in secret, at home.

Mr. Caswall, a graduate of one of our universities, divinity professor in the excellent college at St. Louis, Missouri, U. S., founded by the good missionary Bishop Kemper, in whose diocese Nauvoo is situated, and very favourably known in England by his "*America and the American Church*," is now, we believe, in this his native country, for the purpose of enlisting christian aid for that branch of the Church Catholic, at whose altars he now serves, and in the stability and increased power of which alone can be found the remedy for this frightful fanaticism.* He has just published a most extraordinary pamphlet, the title of which is prefixed to this article, and he meditates a detailed history of Mormonism. It will be at once apparent that he has availed himself of opportunities of investigating this terrible delusion which have fallen to the lot of few : he spent three days at Nauvoo ; he visited the Mormon prophet ; talked and argued with the people ; examined their Teraphim, (though it does not appear that he or any one else was ever permitted to view the celebrated golden plates upon which the new revelation was inscribed ;) saw the temple now building ; and was present at their services, if such they may be called, in company with 2,000 persons ; — and his station and character render his testimony above suspicion.

But our readers are unacquainted with the history of this last falling away, or, if they ever heard of the "latter-day saints" in England, they may have disregarded or forgotten it. About fifteen years ago, one Joseph Smith, born in the town of Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, now about 37 years old, declares that the angel of the Lord appeared to him and directed him to a certain cave where were deposited the golden plates of "the book of Mormon," also the Urim and Thummim of Israel, and the golden breastplate of the high priest. These were in due course exhumed, and they are thus described by Smith's mother, a woman who seems not so much a dupe of her son's knavery as an active agent in his imposture.

"I have myself seen and handled the golden plates ; they are about eight inches long, and six wide ; some of them are sealed together, and are not to be opened, and some of them are loose. They are all connected by a ring which passes through a hole at the end of each plate, and are covered

* Mr. C., p. 58—60, suggests a system of emigration on religious principles, for which we wish that we had room. Another indication, of "a more excellent way," may be found in the scheme of Bishop Chase, in connexion with which we refer to a letter which appears in the present number of the "*Christian Remembrancer*."

with letters beautifully engraved. I have seen and felt also the Urim and Thummim. They resemble two large bright diamonds, set in a bow like a pair of spectacles. My son puts these over his eyes when he reads unknown languages, and they enable him to interpret them in English. I have likewise carried in my hands the sacred breastplate. It is composed of pure gold, and is made to fit the breast very exactly."—*The City of the Mormons*, p. 27.

This new revelation,

"Like Mahometanism, possesses many features in common with the religion of Christ. It professes to admit the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; it even acknowledges the Trinity, the Atonement, and Divinity of the Messiah. But it has cast away that Church which Christ erected upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, and has substituted a false church in its stead. It has introduced a new book as a depository of the revelations of God, which in practice has almost superseded the sacred Scriptures. It teaches men to regard a profane and ignorant impostor as a special prophet of the Almighty, and to consider themselves as saints while in the practice of impiety. It robs them sometimes of their substance, and too often of their honesty; and finally sends them, beneath a shade of deep spiritual darkness, into the presence of that God of truth whose holy faith they have denied."—*The City of the Mormons*, pp. 2, 3.

The Book of Mormon has been published in an English edition, at Manchester, for the use of the "latter-day saints," under which name they are known here; but this is a mutilated edition; the genuine one

"Contains five hundred and eighty-eight duodecimo pages, consisting of fifteen different books, purporting to be written at different times, and by different authors, whose names they respectively bear. The period of time covered by these spurious records is about a thousand years, commencing with the time of Zedekiah, and terminating with the year of our Lord 420. It professes to trace the history of the American aborigines, from the time of their leaving Jerusalem, in the reign of Zedekiah, under one Lehi, down to their final disaster near the hill Camorah, in the state of New York; in which contest, according to 'the prophet Moroni,' about 230,000 were slain in a single battle, and he alone escaped to tell the tale. These records, with which various prophecies and sermons are intermingled, are declared by Smith to have been written on golden plates, in 'the reformed Egyptian character,' and discovered to him by an angel in the year 1823."*—*The City of the Mormons*, pp. 62, 63.

A general view of their doctrine may be gathered from the preacher whom Mr. C. heard.

"He began by stating the importance of forming correct views of the character of God. People were generally content with certain preconceived views on this subject derived from tradition. These views were for the most part incorrect. The common opinion respecting God made him an unjust God, a partial God, a cruel God, a God worthy only of hatred; in fact, 'the greatest devil in the universe.' Thus also people in general had been 'traditioned' to suppose that divine revelation was confined to the old-fashioned book called the Bible, a book principally written in Asia, by Jews, and suited to particular circumstances and particular classes. On the other hand, they supposed that this vast continent of America had been destitute of all revelation for five thousand years, until Columbus discovered it, and 'the good,

* Smith's mother speaks of "fifteen years ago" as the time of the pretended revelation, (see Mr. Caswall, p. 26;) but in this passage Mr. C. dates it 1823: there is an error somewhere, which we cannot explain.

pious, precise Puritans brought over with them, some two hundred years since, that precious old book called the Bible.' Now God had promised to judge all men without respect of persons. If, therefore, the American aborigines had never received a revelation, and were yet to be judged together with the Jews and the Christians, God was most horribly unjust; and he, for his part, would never love such a God; he could only hate him. He said there was a verse somewhere in the Bible, he could not tell where, as he was 'a bad hand at quoting,' but he thought it was in the Revelation. 'If it's not there,' he said, 'read the whole book through, and you'll find it, I guess, somewhere. I hav'n't a Bible with me, I left mine at home, as it ain't necessary.' Now this verse, he proceeded to observe, stated that Christ had redeemed men by his blood out of *every* kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and had made them unto God kings and priests. But in America there were the ruins of vast cities, and wonderful edifices, which proved that great and civilized nations had existed on this continent. If the Bible was true, therefore, God must have had priests and kings among those nations, and numbers of them must have been redeemed by the blood of Christ. Revelations from God must consequently have been granted to them. The Old and New Testaments were therefore only portions of the revelations of God, and not a complete revelation, nor were they designed to be so. 'Am I to believe,' said he, 'that God would cast me or any body else into hell, without giving me a revelation?' God now revealed himself in America just as truly as he had ever done in Asia. The present congregation lived in the midst of wonders and signs equal to those mentioned in the Bible, and they had the blessing of revelation mainly through the medium of that chosen servant of God, Joseph Smith. The Gentiles often came to Nauvoo to look at the prophet Joseph—old Joe, as they profanely termed him—and to see what he was doing; but many who came to laugh remained to pray, and soon the kings and nobles of the earth would count it a privilege to come to Nauvoo and behold the great work of the Lord in these latter days. 'The work of God is prospering,' he said, 'in England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales; in Australia, and at the Cape of Good Hope, in the East and West Indies, in Palestine, in Africa, and throughout America, thousands, and tens of thousands are getting converted by our preachers, are baptized for the remission of sins, and are selling off all they have that they may come to Nauvoo. The great and glorious work has begun, and I defy all earth and hell to stop it.'—*The City of the Mormons*, pp. 11—13.

They believe—but we are almost frightened at transcribing these blasphemies—that, to use the words of a Mormon doctor, who was once an Atheist,

"'The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; that makes three at least who are God, and no doubt there are a great many more.' He went on to state, that the Mormons believe that departed saints become a portion of the Deity, and may be properly denominated 'Gods.'"—*The City of the Mormons*, p. 34.

Smith, their prophet, is proved to have said—

"That he believed Mahomet was a good man; that Mahomet was a true prophet; and that if people molested him he would establish his religion by the sword; and that he would become to this generation a second Mahomet."—P. 76.

For which purpose he has organized a legion consisting at present of seventeen hundred men.

Nor must it be thought that this is an absurd delusion, to which it is foolish to call attention, and that it will die away of itself. Mr. Caswall may by many be thought to overrate the danger; but let us

hear him : having *seen* the thing, he must know more about it than we can pretend to do.

"I felt convinced, that palpable as are the absurdities of Mormonism, it is a system which possesses many elements of strength, and of extension. When the present generation of deceivers and of dupes shall have gone to their graves, a new class of Mormons may have arisen, educated in the principles of the sect, and taught by experience to disavow some features in their religion which are at present its shame and its disgrace. They may consign Joseph Smith to perdition, together with the sweet Psalmist of Israel ; while his doctrines, somewhat refined, may be a rule of faith and action to admiring millions. It remains (under God) for Christians of the present day to determine whether Mormonism shall sink to the level of those fanatical sects which, like new stars, have blazed for a little while, and then sunk into obscurity ; or whether, like a second Mahometanism, it shall extend itself sword in hand, until, throughout western America, Christianity shall be levelled with the dust."—*The City of the Mormons*, p. 56.

"System and discipline, almost equal to those of Rome, have been brought to its aid." They are establishing a Mormon university. Mormonism numbers at the present moment *one hundred thousand* victims, a large portion of whom are natives of England ;—some of them are described as having been members of "the Methodist Episcopal Church," whatever that may be ; and others of different sects ;—but the majority seem to have fallen away, if from anything, from a nominal adherence to our own Church ; and it is appalling enough to be reminded that, of the numbers of emigrants who leave England and Ireland, and who have been educated in the principles of the Church, "few attach themselves to the Church in America, many connect themselves with various dissenting denominations, while still more, it is to be feared, sink into heartless apathy and irreligion," (p. 59;) and again, that "the indifference of the poorer class of English emigrants to the Church of their fathers is truly lamentable. The Roman Catholic emigrant, however poor or friendless, retains his attachment to his faith. The German Lutheran is firm, &c."—p. 80.

As we have seen, these Mormons are not confined to the location of Nauvoo, though this is to be their earthly Zion, and the seat of their temple now building ;* "to assemble there the outcasts and gather together the dispersed from the four corners of the earth, that the sons of strangers may build up its walls, and fly to it as a cloud, and as doves to their windows ;" (p. 10.) and also a sort of

* "The building is a hundred and twenty feet in length, by eighty in breadth ; and is designed to be the finest edifice west of Philadelphia. The Mormon informed me, that in this house the Lord designed to reveal unto his Church things which had been kept secret from the foundation of the world ; and that He had declared that He would here restore the fulness of the priesthood. He showed me the great baptismal font, which is completed, and stands at the centre of the unfinished temple. This font is, in fact, a capacious laver, eighteen or twenty feet square, and about four in depth. It rests upon the backs of twelve oxen, as large as life, and tolerably well sculptured ; but for some reason, perhaps mystical, entirely destitute of *feet*, though possessed of legs. The laver and oxen are of wood, and painted white ; but are to be hereafter gilded, or covered with plates of gold. At this place baptisms for the dead are to be celebrated, as well as baptisms for the healing of diseases ; but baptisms for the remission of sins are to be performed in the Mississippi."—*The City of the Mormons*, p. 16.

caravanserai, founded by revelation, "a house of boarding, a house that strangers may come from afar to lodge therein and let the name of that house be called the Nauvoo House, and let it be a delightful place for man, and a resting place, &c." p. 72. They are to be found, we suspect, where we should least anticipate it: we have already seen one of the preachers boasting that they had proselytes in every part of the globe; and, in the "Times and Seasons," (a semi-monthly magazine, containing the official papers and revelations of Smith, now edited by himself, but formerly by his brother, now deceased, styled Don Carlos Smith,) for April 1, 1842, we have an extract from a letter of Hyde, dated "Jaffa on his way to Jerusalem." From Palestine to Nauvoo is a fearful range.

The party with whom Mr. Caswall steamed from St. Louis to Missouri, consisted of three hundred English emigrants, from the neighbourhood of Preston, who had been converted by the English missionaries of Mormonism; (one of them boasted to Mr. Caswall, of having baptized seven thousand in this country during the last year alone;) they were "decent looking people, and by no means of the lowest class." (p. 4.)—We are tempted, though it is some of the longest, to venture on another extract.

"I am permitted by a Clergyman of the diocese of Chester to give the following extracts from a letter, addressed by him to me, February 4th, 1842.

"For your very kind and satisfactory information as to that arch-impotor, Joe Smith, I most cordially thank you. Mormonism is a heresy of a very dangerous and disgraceful tendency; and I am sorry to add, it has produced effects already in some parishes in England which, in this enlightened age, one could scarcely imagine possible. They first of all laid their blasphemous scheme at Preston, in Lancashire, after taking out a licence at the quarter sessions. This occurred about the year 1836 or 37; and they soon numbered in that locality nearly 500 converts. In 1838, they extended their iniquitous operations to various villages on each side of the Ribble. At Ribchester, the famous Roman station of Ribcunium, they seduced many; and the same results followed in other places near Clitheroe. Since that time, itinerant preachers among the Methodists and Calvinists have joined the unholy compact; and even farmers, labourers, mechanics, and others, —in short, whoever among them could supply the *needful*,—have been persuaded to sell their property, and emigrate to Nauvoo. In 1838, every Mormon in one village, and in other villages probably the same, received a certificate, or passport, of which the following is a copy:

'We do hereby certify that A. B., the bearer of this, is a regular member, and in good standing and fellowship, in the Church of the Latter-day Saints in Waddington, and is a worthy member of the same; and as a token also of our love and good-will, we give unto him this letter of commendation to the esteem and fellowship of the Saints, in any land or country to which he may be pleased to remove.

'March 29, 1838.

'H. C. KIMBALL,

'ORSON HYDE,

'Presiding Elders of said Church.

'This will be called for.'

Three hundred of these certificates were printed at Clitheroe, by which speculation about 15*l*. were realized. * * *

"In England, the preachers of Mormonism generally begin by insinuating among the astonished natives of rural villages, or the weak and wavering classes in larger towns, that our Bible has suffered by translation,

and that it is deficient and incomplete in many particulars. They next declare that the Book of Mormon and the revelations bestowed on Smith and Rigdon are additional favours from the Deity, designed to explain the obscurities and supply the deficiencies of our Scriptures. It never enters into the minds of their dupes to inquire as to the *credentials* of these preachers. They are the eye-witnesses of no miracle: they see no dead raised to life, no dumb qualified to speak, no blind enabled to see.

"One night the Mormon elder commences by observing to his congregation that he does not know what to say, but that he will say whatever the Lord shall put into his mouth. On another night, he gravely announces his intention to read a portion of the old Scriptures for edification; invariably, however, taking care not to confine himself to any particular subject, but to have as extensive a field as possible, in order to weave in, from time to time, such portions of the "Book of Mormon" as he knows to be best adapted to effect his object.

"For the continuance of the fraudulent scheme, they proceed to enact a mock ordination, choosing out of the whole body of converts certain individuals who are deemed most trustworthy. These assume their blasphemous calling on the pretended sanction of the Deity, immerse converts after dark, *confirm* the parties next day, and administer, in the course of two or three days at the farthest, a mock sacrament, to individuals who, in the bewildered state of their minds, scarcely know their right hand from their left.

"It is under the very convenient cloak of night, however, that Mormonism in England performs most of its operations. It is then in the zenith of its glory, converting ignorance into the tool of delusion, chaining it fast by iniquitous discipline, order, and system, and trying with all its energy to make the worse appear the better cause. In such beguiling hours, the secret 'Church Meeting' is held, to the exclusion of every individual except the initiated. High and mighty is the business transacted on such occasions. It consists of exhortations to stand firm, instructions given, explanations offered, visions and revelations stated, gifts received for the 'Bishop of Zion,' confessions made, threatenings held out, converts reprimanded, apostates excommunicated, the successes of Mormonism described, and suggestions offered for removing the difficulties in its way. Inquiries are made in reference to other particulars: for example,—'What kind of people reside in this neighbourhood? What places of worship do they frequent? What opinions have you formed as to the natural bent of their respective dispositions? Will they be disposed to join us, or will they exercise an influence against us? Are they principally in the humble walks of life, or are they of some knowledge and understanding?' If the answer to these and other questions be apparently favourable, the necessary advice is given to the first converts how they may prevail upon more. Suggestions are thrown out how to persuade; and the next step is to urge in every possible way the grievous sin of baptizing infants, and the absolute necessity of *dipping*, as the very *sine quâ non*, the only effectual path to everlasting salvation."—*City of the Mormons*, pp. 63—68.

Well may we sympathize with Mr. Caswall's horror at finding in the Mormon congregation "numerous groups of the peasantry of Old England: there too were the bright and innocent looks of little children, who, born among the privileges of England's Church, baptized with her consecrated waters, and taught to lisp her prayers and repeat her catechism, had now been led into this den of heresy, to listen to the ravings of a false prophet, and to imbibe the principles of a semi-pagan delusion." (p. 9.) Semi-pagan! ten thousand times worse than paganism! for as Mr. Caswall acknowledges, "the Indians are superior in morality and common sense to the 'latter day saints.'" p. 30.

It only remains to add that the Mormon prophet is a great rascal, as these very Indians say, p. 31, in so many words: coarse and plebeian in aspect, a "curious mixture of the knave and clown;" addicted to drunkenness and profane swearing, vindictive, passionate, and illiterate* in the extreme; and that he makes his religious character the means of considerable gain by combining all sorts of trades and professions; and his deluded followers are guilty of constant intemperance and robberies. It may be as well to append the following as a specimen of the consolation, which Mormon emigrants may expect. "Many of the English who have lately come here have expressed great disappointment on their arrival.—If they are not satisfied here I have only to say this to them,—Don't stay whining about me, but go back to England and be ——." *Smith's Sermon, 9 May, 1841, quoted p. 54.*

We have been particular in our account of this execrable imposture, not only because we think it a plain duty to expose it, and also for the sake of the Clergy in whose extensive parishes these emissaries of Satan may at this moment be at work unknown to them; but for two other reasons, and very solemn ones.

1. Because it will help to realize to earnest minds a conviction of the awful nature of these, which may in no figure be, the "latter days." Dark shadows of the coming Antichrist are, from time to time, projected across the Church's path, to bid her walk warily, and as looking for "the coming of the Lord." We would not pronounce that the Mormon apostasy is the prophetic antichrist; but it is an image, an earnest, a figure, a forecast, as it were, of antichrist; just as the gnostic, and indeed every other heresy and form of schism, is antichristian; just as rationalism may be a specimen of the mind, and Mahomet of the person, and the French apostasy of the persecution, of Antichrist. Nor will this conviction be lessened if we look, and this not fancifully, into this miserable "deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish."

In some mysterious way, each eminent type of antichrist has been strangely mixed up with the Jewish system, has meddled with Jerusalem and the Jews;—Julian the apostate attempted to rebuild the holy city; even Napoleon Buonaparte had some such scheme; he was on his road to Jerusalem when "the hook was put in his nose." It seems that, in some sort, one especial mark of "the mystery of iniquity," will be to resuscitate the Jewish forms; to wrest holy symbols to the "doctrine of devils;" to "sit in the temple of God;" to

* Mr. Caswall took with him a Greek MS. of the Psalter, to test the prophet's powers. "No," said he, viz. the prophet, "it ain't Greek at all; except, perhaps, a few words. What ain't Greek is Egyptian; and what ain't Egyptian is Greek. Them figures is Egyptian hieroglyphics, and them which follows is the interpretation of the hieroglyphics, written in the reformed Egyptian."—p. 35. But as Mr. Joseph Smith quotes the fathers, we recommend the Record to establish a parallel between Mormonism and, what their hand-bills are pleased to call, Puseyism. Messrs. Seeley will be grateful for the hint. "Crysostom (*sic*) says, that the Marchionites (*sic*) practised baptism for the dead, &c."—*Times and Seasons, April 15, 1842.*

engraft upon the types of the law some novel worship, like, yet different from, the old one. Let us attend to the startling coincidence of the temple building on the Mount at Nauvoo, the "corner stone," as they blasphemously declare it, "He had appointed for Zion,"—the ingathering of the people, who have been scattered from every land,—the priesthood to be restored,—the sacred book of the new law of Mormon,—the Urim and Thummim,—the breastplate,—and the great laver, or sea, resting on the twelve oxen—all Jewish emblems and all engrafted into Mormonism.

Again : another sign of Antichrist shall be his inexplicable pretensions to miraculous powers—"whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders ; and for this cause, God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie;"—so, in the Mormon creed, "we believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues."—(*Times and Seasons*, vol. iii. p. 709.) "The old man replied, that the healing of the sick, the casting out of devils, and the speaking of unknown tongues, were very frequent in the 'Latter-day Church.'"—(*The City of the Mormons*, p. 41;) and the "strong delusion" may find a sad counterpart in what the Mormon doctor owned—that "Smith might be a swindler, a liar, a drunkard, a swearer, and yet be a true prophet."—p. 46.

Again : Egypt, according to the belief of the ancient Church, as well as Sodom and Babylon—"the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified," was a type of that polluted Jerusalem, in which Antichrist should reign. We can see indications of this correspondence in the case of Mormonism,—the last, and to us, most remarkable type of Antichrist. The "Book of Mormon" is written in the "reformed Egyptian." Papyri, with Egyptian inscriptions, are kept in the *sanctum* of the Mormons: these writings they pretend to be those of Abraham, while in Egypt: they attempt to decipher the hieroglyphics: four mummies in Joseph Smith's possession he declares to be a king of Egypt with his two wives and daughter. Of course, we cannot enter fully into the matter here; but the "form of creeping things and abominable beasts, portrayed on the wall—the dark chambers of imagery"—spoken of by the prophet, have always been referred to the Egyptian hieroglyphic paintings: we know these to have been of a religious and symbolical character. All false religions are demon-worship; and the revival of this "doctrine of devils" is very extraordinary, coupled with all the other indications and glimpses, as it were, of some more than ordinary manifestation of satanic power and malice.

These things, viewed singly, may not bear out our meaning; but taken altogether, they are, to say the least, significant: anyhow, we ought not to be taken by surprise. We must watch; watch, as for the rising of the day, so for the great gathering in the heavens. But we ought never to behold "a vile person stand up in his estate," "a raiser of taxes," "setting himself in the place of God," proclaiming a new revelation, taking to himself the powers of the Church, and

the rest, without a thrill as at approaching evil, however faintly defined, and the revelation of something we know not what, save that, if it be not antichrist, most certainly it is of antichrist. Anyhow, it is the part of Christian faith to look at these sudden and extensive apostasies, in which tens of thousands make shipwreck of that tremendous faith in Christ, into which they were baptized, as the active agency of the devil and his angels : we must believe in hell and its powers as powers,—not as mere abstract tendencies, which is all that the irreligion of the day can arrive at,—even if it reach thus far !

It is as though the clouds were sweeping together in vast convulsion for the last and most awful storm ; as though the hosts of the prince of this world were mustering for the great and final conflict ; and if ever there were on the face of this earth, (and here we would be but understood to speak of America as apart from that noble Church which it should be our boast to love, and in some things, to imitate,) if ever, we repeat, there were a chosen battlefield for this fierce strife, and for the sorest persecution of the Church, surely we might, without presumption, expect that it would be a country whose beginnings were contempt of all law, human and divine ;—whose glories are tainted with the unvisited sins of their fathers, unnatural rebellion and kinsmen's blood ;—a land, and we say it with sorrow, as of those who have sprung from the same loins with ourselves, in which the godless sentiment is acted upon, and not avowed only, that as a state it has nothing to do with souls, and that truth has no standard, or, in other words, that God has deserted His people, and given them up to the stormy excesses of their own self-willed and reprobate hearts ;—a land whose children are brought up without religion,—for this is the same as to say that in religion all forms may be equally right, or equally wrong ;—a land where commercial pursuits blight christian faith in its very bud ;—a land where the popular breath, and none but results apparently successful, and expediency and truckling to interested motives, and compromising duty for applause, have their place in the most sacred affairs,—for this is the essence of voluntaryism ;—a land whose brightest triumphs are the oppression and pillage of the Clergy, the contempt of old Reverence, and Law, and ancient Duty, and the dignified proprieties of primitive faith and traditional awe for holy persons, holy things, holy seasons, and holy places ;—a land whose especial boast is, that it is the newest, most original, most worldly, and most enlightened among all the nations of the earth ; whose debts to the accumulated experience and wisdom of ages are the fewest ; whose motto is civil and religious liberty, equality, and freedom from every restraint save that of a corrupt heart, and that wisdom which is “earthly, sensual, devilish :” if in such a land we might anticipate the chosen seat of Antichrist, whose “iniquity doth already work,” and where “even now are many antichrists,”—surely such a land is the United States of America ; and this brings us to our last reflection, which is this :—

2. That in the Church Catholic, in all its doctrine, and in all its order, is the sole antagonist and remedy of such an abominable

apostasy as Mormonism. It is significant that the Romanists, who, with so many and grievous corruptions, have retained the substance of the one true ancient Church, almost alone present an impregnable front to this satanic deceit; for it were too much to suppose that our own branch of the great catholic body in America, only just breathing after persecution, and just awaking to a consciousness of her gifts, has yet had either time or consolidation to do more than witness, in the person of her truest sons, such as Mr. Caswall, against it. And it may be instructive to some among ourselves, who would humbly read the signs of the times, and who are not too proud to see God holding up the sins of others as beacons by which we may steer, to point out what some of our readers may have anticipated us in perceiving, which is this:—

Mormonism is not so much a heresy, or rather an apostasy, single and complete in itself, as the aggregate and compound and ultimate result of nearly all defections from the Catholic faith and communion: it is the combination into one of all scattered attempts to substitute something wiser and better for the Church: it is the gathering together into one focus the varied and discordant rays of error: it is the perfect development of an unbelieving age: it is rationalism, to adopt the phrase for the mere sake of avoiding circumlocution, full grown. As Mahomedanism is the result of the greater ancient heresies, so Mormonism seems but the unchecked completion of the spirit of dissent. There is perhaps not a sectarian body which could not find its essential element of opposition to the Church, what would be termed its peculiar tenet, embodied in Mormonism. We will give an instance or two as specimens of the rest, and these shall be extracted from their creed:—

“We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in his son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost:”—an article identical with the Arian and Socinian formula: it is the truth, but not the *whole* truth.

“We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam’s transgression:”—Socinian again, and Pelagian.

“We believe that these ordinances are,—1st. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; 2d. Repentance; 3d. Baptism *by immersion* for the remission of sins, &c.,” which is what the so-called Baptists urge.

“We believe in the same organization that existed in the Primitive Church, viz. Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, Evangelists, &c.

“We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelations, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, &c.”—adopted verbatim from Irvingism.

“We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the Word of God:”—identical with the *principle* of the followers of Johanna Southcote.

“We believe in the literal gathering of Israel, and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built on this continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and that the earth will be renewed, and receive its paradisaic glory:”—which, though it may be true in a Catholic sense, yet, as it is understood by the Mor-

monists, is the ancient heresy of the Millenarians, and the opinion of a considerable school of interpreters of prophecy among ourselves.

"We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may:"—which is but a plain statement of that open denial of the stringent claims of the Catholic Creed, which, under the names of Dissent, Latitudinarianism, Indifference, or Rationalism, is *the crying characteristic sin* of our day.

And it ought to be a subduing thought to those among ourselves, who, be they dissenters or pseudo-Churchmen, talk of the right of private judgment, and clamour against the tyranny and bigotry and formalism of exclusive dogmas, just to reflect that the Mormons adopt these same objections and avail themselves of these very tenets, and that their avowed confession of faith (*Caswall*, pp. 80—82) looks fair, and reads well, and sounds charitable and comprehensive,—that their additions to "the faith once delivered to the saints," are on the common plea of making the Church more spiritual,* and more in accordance with what they, without regard to the testimony of the Universal Church, choose to think, upon their own private judgment, was or ought to have been Apostolic practice;—and yet, with all its showy seeming, let such men consider that Mormonism is the most frightful and anti-christian apostasy and satanic delusion which perhaps the world ever saw; and we know how this argument will tell upon the question of the alleged bigotry of the Church.

In quitting this most painful and threatening subject, we thank Mr. Caswall most sincerely for his instructive, although appalling, pamphlet; and in all his ministrations, be they on the banks of the Missouri or the Thames, we "bid him God speed," we "wish him good luck in the name of the Lord!"

* One of the Mormons said "that the Church of England had a form of godliness, but denied the power thereof, and that it was the duty of all men to turn away from her; that she denied that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are communicated at this day to the people of God." (p. 37.) Another renegade said "that the Thirty-nine Articles were a bundle of inconsistencies from end to end," (p. 38.) and he wished to know "how the commission of the clergy could be proved without miracles," (p. 39.) that "the English succession must have come through Rome; and that Rome was the mother of harlots." (p. 48.) Another said "that the English Church was merely a Parliament Church," (*ibid.*) And, to conclude, "The method in which the Mormons baptize is a perfect burlesque on the holy initiatory sacrament of the gospel. On one occasion, a hundred and sixty-five persons were baptized by immersion at Nauvoo, some for the remission of sins, and some for their deceased friends, which is their baptism for the dead. This business was done by seven elders, who enjoyed it as a capital frolic. One of these elders baptized a woman six times during the same day. Not satisfied with this, she presented herself a seventh time, when the elder jocosely remarked, "What! haven't you got wet enough already?" A very tall man offering himself, the elder, who is very stout, laughed aloud, and said, "I am the only one big enough to put tall chaps like you under water."

It seems worthy of remark, that, as it seems, they have nothing—God be praised that He has vindicated His holiest gift!—which, in the way of substitute or imitation, profanes the Holy Eucharist. May not this be significant of those "seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy—commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received" *"μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς πιστοῖς"* 1 Tim. iv. 3.

CHAPTERS ON ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.—No. III.

CURATES AND CURACIES.

It was doubtless both the intention and practice of the early Church for the bishops personally to interfere in the selection of the candidates for ordination, and by no means to delegate such an important duty to subalterns. In a small diocese it was possible for the bishop to have an accurate personal knowledge of every parish, and of the kind of minister required for its benefit, and thus to make appointments in which the fitness of the person for the place was as much considered as his general qualifications for ordination. Powers, however, have now become delegated; and whilst the bishop retains to himself and his immediate chaplains the duty of strictly examining into the moral and religious fitness of the candidate, he delegates to the incumbents in his diocese, the duty of presenting to the bishop no candidate who is not fitted for the people and the parish to which he proposes to apply his services. The very careless manner in which curacies are constantly given to young men, perfect strangers to the incumbent, and, though pious and excellent men, yet totally unsuited for the parish in which they are to be fixed, calls for great reprobation. Incumbents should remember, that, in the choice of a curate, they have to consider the duty devolved on them by the Church, of training up her members—her junior ministers, without, at the same time, neglecting that duty which they owe to their parishioners, of consulting their feelings, and providing for their benefit in the selection. In the one case, they would not request their diocesans to ordain a young and inexperienced man to be sent down, alone, to a country parish, entirely deprived of the direction and advice of his rector, who is non-resident either in London, or on some more valuable piece of preferment; whilst, in the other case, they would extend as little patronage to “clerical agents” and their “houses of call for curates,” as their wives do to “domestic bazaars,” and other slave markets; they would no longer encourage the quasi-Simony to which these agencies give rise.

Perhaps very many of our readers consider these clerical agencies either as harmless, or perhaps as useful; are they aware of the tariff established by them in titles to orders? It was not long since that a friend of ours, desirous of obtaining a curacy, called on one of the most respectable of these clerical agents. The agent showed him his list of vacancies, described their various qualifications, *à la Robins*, and concluded by recommending one in Yorkshire as a desirable situation. “I suppose,” said the applicant, “Mr. ———, there will be some few fees to pay you?” “Why, yes, a couple of guineas, or so, merely for the trouble of writing to the gentleman, and settling the matter.” “I can hardly object to that,” replied our friend; “perhaps you will then write to the rector?” The agent seemed to hesitate; at last he rejoined, “I do not know, sir—

whether—perhaps—you are acquainted with the fact of this being a title, sir?" "Of course," replied the applicant. "Why you see, sir," replied the agent, "that rather alters the price." "Indeed!" said our friend. "Why yes, sir, titles vary from twenty-five pounds to about two hundred." "And this?" "Would be twenty-five pounds; or rather twenty-five guineas, including all expenses." "Good morning," said our friend, as he left the agency office.

Surely this looks like simony. Not, indeed, under the act of Elizabeth, nor indeed according to the canon; because neither the act nor the canon ever contemplated such a transaction, and therefore the latter provided merely for the simoniacal conduct of the bishop or his surrogate, and the fees to be received by his inferior officers. Yet what is the case? The bishop delegates to the incumbent the duty of selecting his curate, guaranteeing his ordination if found morally and religiously fit. The incumbent delegates this power of choosing to the clerical agent, who demands a regular payment according to the value of the title. Is not this simony of the highest kind? No, it may be said, the money is not paid for the imposition of hands—God forbid. But when we consider that the canons have decided that, in the majority of persons desirous of admittance into the ministerial office, a title is a pre-requisite, and that title is purchased for money, does not this become the obtaining ordination by the means of a simoniacal payment? With these remarks we pass on to the minutiae of our subject.

It would be a work of supererogation to set out the canons and other ecclesiastical ordinances relating to the ordaining of curates, and, at the same time, hardly consistent with the scheme of these articles, intended, as they are, rather to set out the latest alterations in the law of matters spiritual, than to enter at length into the theory of particular ordinances in the Church and enactments by the State. The latest enactment respecting curates has been that omnibus Act, the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 106, known as the Pluralities and Residence Act; and as minutiae in all matters are the better understood in tabular forms, we have preferred reducing, as far as the Act would allow us, the various clauses of this statute into the annexed Table.

TABULAR VIEW OF THE ENACTMENTS IN THE ACT 1 & 2 VICTORIA, CAP. 106,
RELATING TO CURATES.

POWER OF BISHOPS TO APPOINT CURATES.

Diocesan may appoint and license a curate, absolutely, and without previous summons, to serve any church or chapel, or both, in a benefice.

(1) If any spiritual person, not licensed by the bishop under the previous clauses of non-residence, not *actually* residing thereon nine months in each year, shall absent himself from the same for three months, either altogether, or to be accounted at several times, without leaving a duly licensed and approved curate to perform his duties. Sec. 75.

No appeal.

(2) Or shall for a month after the death, resignation, or removal of his curate, neglect to notify the same to the bishop. Sec. 75.

Ditto.

(3) Or shall for four months after such death, resignation, or removal, neglect to nominate to the bishop a *proper* curate. Sec. 75.

No appeal.

Diocesan may appoint and license a curate,* after previous notice † to incumbent to nominate, and three months neglect on part of incumbent to obey such notice.

Where the bishop having reason to believe that the duties are inadequately performed, shall be certified by the commissioners, or the major part of them, whom he is authorized to appoint, to inquire into the facts,* that such is the case; the certificate to be in writing. Sec. 77.

The incumbent may appeal to the archbishop within one month of the service on him of the notice* requiring him to nominate a curate.

* Stipend same as in cases of non-residence, and not, except in cases of negligence, to exceed half net proceeds of benefice.

† Must specify grounds of notice.

* No power to take evidence on oath. The commissioners, four beneficed clergy of the diocese, one the rural dean of the district, and one other appointed by incumbent.

* The service must be personal.

Diocesan may appoint and license after previous notice* and three months neglect on part of the incumbent to obey.

* Need not specify grounds of notice. Stipend not to exceed one-fifth net annual value of benefice.

(1) If annual value of a benefice obtained after 14th August, 1833, exceed £500, and population amount to 3,000. Sec. 78.

(2) Or annual value exceed £500, and population less than 3,000, but separate church or chapel in the benefice not less than two miles from the mother church, with a hamlet or district of not less than 400 persons. Sec. 78.

Appeal to archbishop within one month after service* of notice to appoint, or notice of actual appointment by the bishop.

* Service need not be personal, but at his dwelling-house, or last place of residence.

After requisition* to incumbent, and three months' default, diocesan may appoint two curates, or if one already, one other curate.

* Need not specify grounds. Stipends of both curates together not to exceed that legally due to one, except with consent of the incumbent.

If a spiritual person has become incumbent of a benefice after 20th July, 1813, or shall hereafter become so, be non-resident, and the population exceed 2,000. Sec. 86.

Appeal same as under section 78.

STIPENDS OF CURATES OF INCUMBENTS INSTITUTED BEFORE

JULY 20, 1813.

Diocesan restrained from appointing any stipend.

(1) Above £75, together with house of residence, gardens and stables. Sec. 84.

(2) Or a further sum of £15 in lieu thereof. Sec. 84.

OF NON-RESIDENT INCUMBENTS INSTITUTED AFTER

JULY 20, 1813.

Annual value.	Stipend.	Population.	
Not more than £80.	£80, or annual value if less than £80.		Sec. 85.
Not more than £100.	£100, or annual value if less than £100.	300.	Sec. 85.
Not more than £120.	£120, or annual value if less than £120.	500.	Sec. 85.
Not more than £135.	£135, or annual value if less than £135.	750.	Sec. 85.
Not more than £150.	£150, or annual value if less than £150.	1,000.	Sec. 85.
Not more than £400.	£100 if curate resident, and no other cure.	Under 300.	Sec. 86.
Ditto Ditto.	Bishop may add £50 to curate's stipend if resident, and no other cure.	500.	Sec. 86.

In all other cases the amount of the stipend is to be, as at present, a matter of arrangement between the incumbent and the curate, the former taking care to inform the bishop of the amount on his application for the license; and the bishop specifying in the license the sum agreed upon. Sect. 83. And in the case of non-residents, the 80th section gives the bishop power to assign a lower stipend, on the condition of the special reasons for the act appearing in the license. Other provisions are made by the two following sections for the case

of an incumbent who has two benefices, and resides on them both during certain portions of the year, and who is compelled by the Act to grant the curate who interchanges the duty with him a stipend, not greater than that allowed under sect. 85 for the larger benefice, nor less than that similarly assignable for the smaller incumbency; and also for such curates as serve, or incumbents as serve as curates, in neighbouring parishes, to whom the bishop may assign a salary of 30*l.* less than that required by the 85th or 86th sections.

LICENSES.

Nature of Incumbency.

Every application for a curate's license by an incumbent who is *non-resident*, must specify,

Specifications.

(1) Whether he intends to perform any part of the duty, and where he resides, or intends residing.

(2) The salary, and whether resident or non-resident curate, and whether in house of residence or not.

(3) If not in residence-house, where is he to reside? does he serve any other cure, or has any other preferment?

(4) The value of benefice, number of churches and chapels in it, and date of admission of incumbent. Sec. 42, 43, and 81.

Fees.

Ten shillings over and above the stamp duty.*

* One signature of the declaration required by the Act of Uniformity, and one certificate of such signature sufficient in the case of a curate licensed to two curacies. Sec. 82.

Every application for a curate's license by an incumbent who is resident or not, must specify,

That the one *bonâ fide* intends to pay, the other *bonâ fide* intends to receive, the whole stipend stated in the application, with abatement for rent, or consideration for the use of the glebe-house; or any other deduction* or abatement whatever. Sec. 81.†

* Except where the stipend amounts to entire value of the benefice, when it shall be subject to all such charges and outgoings as legally affect the value, or to any loss or diminution which may lessen the value without the default or neglect of the incumbent. Sec. 91.

† All agreements between incumbents and curates in fraud or derogation of all or any of the provisions of this Act, absolutely void, and not to be pleaded or given in evidence in any court of law or equity.

Previously to the year 1817, a curate had his remedy at common law, though under great disadvantages, equally with that in the courts ecclesiastical, for the recovery of his stipend. An Act passed in that year (57 Geo. III. c. 99), by its 74th section took away the common law remedy, wherever that in the spiritual courts was given by the Act; and this clause being re-enacted in the 109th section of the present Act, the curate is now confined to his remedy by monition and sequestration for the recovery of his stipend. And by the 90th section, he, or his representatives, within twelve months of his leaving his curacy, or dying, may recover by that means not only what may remain unpaid in a *bonâ fide* case; but supposing the curate to have accepted a less sum than that stated in the license, and to have given his receipt for it, he, or his representatives, may recover the balance of the legal amount from the fraudulent incumbent.

At the end of the Act which we have been analyzing, is a respectable legal olio, of some twenty clauses, on about half as many different

subjects; such must be the conclusion of our paper, into a stray corner of which we must gather all that now remains unnoticed in this lengthy statute. By the 92d clause, where an incumbent has assigned the entire income of his living to the curate, he may deduct from it so much as may be required for preventing the dilapidation of the chancel and the house of residence, so that it does not exceed one-fourth of the receipts and where the annual value being not more than 150*l.*, from some cause or other. the stipend is less than the full annual value; then, where the repairs exceed the difference between the stipend and the annual value, the surplus, to the amount of one-fourth of the stipend, may be deducted from the curate's salary; at least such we believe to be the meaning of the following words:—"And it shall be also lawful for the bishop in like manner to allow any spiritual person holding any benefice, the annual value whereof shall not exceed 150*l.*, to deduct from the stipend assigned to the curate in each year, so much money as shall have been actually expended in such repairs above the amount of the surplus remaining of such value after payment of such stipend; provided that the sum so deducted, after laying out such surplus, shall not in any year exceed one-fourth part of such stipend." By the next clause, 93, curates directed to reside in the residence-house, may have certain portions of the glebe assigned to them, at a rent to be decided by the archdeacon, the rural dean, and one neighbouring clergyman; whilst 94 provides that the curate who receives the entire income, shall pay taxes for the house of residence as if the actual incumbent. The last point necessary to be noticed, is the power given to an incumbent, with the permission of his bishop, to compel a curate to resign after six months' notice, and to deliver up the residence-house, under a penalty of forty shillings a day for disobedience. To these clauses, 95, 96, there are two exceptions; first, in the case of a new incumbent, the time of the notice is shortened to six weeks; and secondly, (1 & 2 Vict. c. 107, s. 18,) no curate duly licensed to a district church or chapel can be affected by the death or avoidance of the incumbent of the parish, but only by a revocation under the hand and seal of the bishop.

This paper may reasonably be concluded by a case decided, not many months ago, in the Court of Exchequer, regarding the claim which a curate, appointed by sequestrators to undertake the cure during the interval between the death of one incumbent and the appointment of his successor, has upon the new incumbent. The case was this. On the death of the plaintiff's father, who was incumbent of St. James's, Colchester, the sequestrators requested the plaintiff, as he was in holy orders, and already licensed to a neighbouring cure, to undertake the duties of the Church until the new incumbent should be appointed. This the plaintiff did; and on the appointment of the defendant, sent in his claim to him for remuneration, which was refused by the defendant, and the action brought to recover the salary. After some technical objections had been amended, the

cause came on for hearing, and the point for the plaintiff was, whether, under the 10th section of 28 Hen. VIII. c. 11, a clergyman doing duty during a vacancy, under an appointment from the sequestrators, without a regular license from the bishop for that cure, was not entitled to be paid by the next incumbent. The defendant took the objection of no regular license quoad hoc, and also that the new Act, 2 Vict. c. 106, barred the plaintiff's right under the statute of Henry. "The court," said Mr. Baron Parke, "was unanimous in opinion that the plaintiff ought to recover. As to the operation of the recent statute on that of Hen. VIII., *it was enough to say that it could only bar the plaintiff by express enactments*, of which there were none to be found in it; and as it did not appear that the plaintiff's appointment was of a permanent nature, it was clear that no license was necessary. Under these circumstances the judgment of the court must be for the plaintiff." *

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Baptismal Regeneration, opposed both by the Word of God and the Standards of the Church of England. By the Rev. CAPEL MOLYNEUX, B.A., Minister of Trinity Episcopal Chapel, Woolwich. London: Seeley and Burnside. 1842.

IN our last number we commenced the consideration of Mr. Molyneux's arguments in favour of his paradoxical thesis, that the Church of England "does not teach but opposes" the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. We flatter ourselves that we showed how little support he gains from the Articles,—that the limitation they make of the grace of the sacraments to those who receive them worthily stands him in no stead, inasmuch as all infants are held to receive that of Baptism worthily,—that the previous faith and repentance necessary in adults, and *confirmed and increased* in the reception of Baptism, do not prove regeneration to take place before instead of in and by that blessed sacrament; because, while faith and repentance have, by God's grace, been implanted in men's hearts from the beginning, regeneration is a benefit peculiar to the Gospel covenant, involving a change of situation, circumstances, and constitution, to which the saints of the elder covenant were strangers *while on earth*,—involving all that mighty and mysterious fellowship with the universal Family, to which St. Paul tells the Hebrew converts they had been brought, (Heb. ix. 22, 23, 24,) and to which his whole argument shows they might have been brought, to no finally saving effect. In the language of Waterland, "Faith and repentance are not regeneration, but qualifications for regeneration." We cannot pause on this question at present, further than by remarking, that if the school to which Mr. Molyneux belongs, (of which, however, we are bound in candour to

* Dakins, *Clerk*, v. Seaman, *Clerk*. Exchequer, April 27. Legal Guide, Vol. VIII., No. 4.

say he is a very extreme specimen,) would calmly and candidly consider the exceeding difference indicated in the New Testament between men's condition before and after the day of Pentecost, their theology would gain both in accuracy and depth.

Mr. Molyneux now takes leave of the Articles, (with what fortune in his encounter with them, we have seen,) but he ought not to have done so quite so soon. He ought to have tried to harmonize Article XVI. with his views. As it is *prima facie* opposed to them, and as he has not attempted to do away with its adverse aspect, we do not feel constrained to dwell on it ourselves. He takes no notice, moreover, of a fact, which probably, indeed, he does not know, that in Article IX., in the sentence "to them that believe and are baptized," the word *renatis* answers in the Latin version to *baptized* in the English.

In passing from the Articles to the formularies of our Church, Mr. Molyneux endeavours to maintain for the former a superiority in respect of authority, which he says "is important, because it is on expressions occurring rather in the formularies and services than in the Articles of the Church, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration is grounded, and whereon its advocates take their stand; whereas—admitting that such expressions justified their interpretation of them—it would, in opposition to the Articles speaking a different language, be utterly untenable, and avail nothing in respect of their cause." In opposition to this, we maintain the authority of the formularies to be equal to that of the Articles; for we cannot imagine how any can be greater than that which a book, to all of which certain parties have declared their "unfeigned assent and consent," has over those parties. This the Clergy have done in regard to the Prayer-Book; and were they to find—what we see no fear of their finding—any inconsistency between it and the Articles, their choice would certainly lie, not between the two authorities, but between an honest and dishonest course of action,—between continuing to eat the bread of the Church of England and frankly surrendering it.

From this little indication, we cannot help suspecting that Mr. Molyneux's "assent and consent" to the Prayer-Book is not very cordial. We shall soon see that it would be wonderful if it were.

He denies, however, that the services are against him, arguing that those for Public Baptism require and suppose "a profession of faith and promise of obedience," in deference to which the recipient is considered regenerate, *i. e.* that if such faith were really his own he would be regenerate before Baptism, according to an argument of Mr. Molyneux's, which we have already refuted. But let us see, and in seeing, let us feel that we can never sufficiently admire Mr. Molyneux's boldness, how he deals with the case in which no sponsors and no profession are required—that of Private Baptism.

"It is true, that in the service for Private Baptism, sponsors are not required; but an emergency of a very pressing nature is here supposed, and the Church does all she can to meet the emergency: this is the exception, not the rule. Yet even here, the principle we contend for is not abandoned,—quite the contrary; the minister, in this case, is required by the rubric, together with those present, to call upon God for the blessing *before* he baptizes, and the blessing being asked, is, as in the other services, supposed to be vouchsafed *before* the administration of the rite. Thus integrity of principle, and consistency of practice, are maintained throughout."

—Pp. 52, 53.

Regeneration in this case is "supposed to be vouchsafed *before* the administration of the rite," says Mr. Molyneux. In this same case, "this child is now by the laver of regeneration in Baptism received, &c." says the Church of England. Verily she not "only does not teach but opposes" Mr. Molyneux's doctrine.

"Next," says our author, "let us turn to the Catechism." With all our hearts, say we; we never were readier to obey a summons. The first point on which Mr. Molyneux fastens, is the assertion of pre-requisites for Baptism in every case, repentance and faith being demanded in adults, and a promise of both being made for infants by their sureties. In order that we may not be supposed to blink any of our author's arguments, we present our readers with the conclusion he draws from this.

"*Why then?*" observe,—it is a matter of surprise! an objection is anticipated,—some one is supposed to say, 'But since repentance and faith are indispensable in order to baptism, *why then* are infants, who cannot be personally subjects of them, baptized?' This very supposed, and felt, difficulty determines the view of the Catechism; for, on the principle of baptismal regeneration, no such difficulty could have presented itself, or been at all anticipated; if baptism be the all-effectual means of regeneration, then what question would exist about the infant's fitness for its reception? The only fitness for regeneration is sin and corruption; the only subject on which it acts is the sinner: and since infants are, without controversy, "shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin," they are, without further qualification, eminently fitted for the operation of regenerating grace; there would be *then* no difficulty at all about their baptism. But the *fact* of a difficulty being contemplated and suggested, shows that such is not the view of our Catechism; while the *nature* of the difficulty itself, as there suggested, evidently imports, that unless we can, somehow or other, regard the infant as possessed of repentance and faith, or in the light of a penitent believer, it is not a fit subject for baptism, nor can the rite, with propriety, be administered. And how, then, is the difficulty met, the objection removed? Just in the way which might be expected;—not by the recognition of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; not by the assertion that baptism will itself confer these essential graces,—but, by the charitable recognition and acceptance of the profession of others instead of its own: by accepting the proxy for the principal; by identifying the child with its sponsors, and regarding the profession of the former as that of the latter, and actually dealing with it as though it were so. It is thus the Catechism meets the objection, and solves the difficulty. Infants are baptized, it teaches, "because they promise both repentance and faith by their sureties." And hence, by reason of the promise, and profession, made by sureties on the part of the child, the child is regarded as itself possessed of the requisite graces,—in the eye of the Church it has, when presented at the font, repentance and faith, and makes profession of them,—and on this ground, and no other, baptism is administered. I call particular attention to this point, (because of such moment,) that repentance and faith are not promised for children as the consequence of, but qualification for, baptism. The Catechism does not teach, (as some would perhaps have it,) that on condition of the Church's baptizing infants, they shall hereafter repent and believe; but, on condition of their appearing at the font as penitent believers, that the Church will baptize them. It is impossible to deny that this is the view of the Catechism, for the question is not, 'What will follow baptism?' but what is required of persons to be (or in order to be) baptized? In other words, what must precede baptism as a qualification for its reception in the candidates? And it is specifically and decisively asserted, that, in every case, without exception, repentance and faith are, and must be, the pre-requisites; and it proceeds then to show (as I have explained) on what principle infants can be regarded as though possessed of these graces, and so justly entitled to the administration of the rite."—P. 54—57.

As the whole of this argument is built on a misapprehension regarding the different degrees of grace, a want of distinction between those beginnings of better things whereby God's Spirit implants repentance and faith in fallen man, and that "destruction of the

old Adam nativity," that new spiritual calling and creation which was unknown in the world before the day of Pentecost, and to which each individual must be a stranger until his Baptism, which we have already answered, we need not dwell long on it now. We must, however, add, that "sin and corruption" are not "the only fitness for Regeneration." Other qualifications, Faith and Repentance, are requisite in adults, not, indeed, as purchase-money for it, but as conditions without which in the nature of things it would be meaningless and dead. With infants, not in the article of death, the stipulations by proxy are necessary, as a security that the unspeakable gift will not be abused but duly cherished and developed.

Mr. M. then passes in a very hurried manner over those passages in the Prayer-book, which bear most decisively against him — the declarations in the Baptismal Service that the baptized child is regenerate; and the answer in the Catechism, wherein the catechumen is taught to pronounce himself so. To these he gives the hackneyed explanation of his party, that the whole proceeds on a charitable hypothesis. Granting for a moment that the Baptismal Service admits of this explanation, which, when viewed in connexion with the Articles and other formularies, it altogether refuses, how can it apply to the Catechism? "I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Who ever heard of teaching any one to proceed on a charitable hypothesis in regard to himself? Truly the lesson were but too easily learned. On this one answer in the Catechism, which no sophistry can evade or explain away, might we take our stand; nor could we express our "unfeigned assent and consent" to the Prayer-book, if we believed that the first lesson it taught a child was to say that of himself, which in all probability was quite untrue.

In the concluding part of the Catechism, Mr. M. finds the following argument (?) on his side:—

"Nor is the remaining statement, 'a means whereby we receive the same,' at all at variance with this interpretation, as—if we will let the Church speak for herself—will appear in a moment. For, in the first place, observe, the statement is *a means*, not *the means*;—this is very remarkable! why did not the framers of the Catechism declare it here to be the means? Because evidently they did not so regard it; nor intend that their disciples should. A means is all that they avouch concerning it, and *a means* it may be, doubtless sometimes is,—who disputes it? But this is widely different from *the means*."—P. 64.

It is difficult to maintain a discussion with a man who can seriously argue thus. Does Mr. M., when he reads in the Collect for the Second Sunday after Easter, the words "hast given unto us Thine only Son to be unto us both *a sacrifice* for sin, &c." infer, from the indefinite article that other sacrifices for sin have been given us also?

Finally, Mr. Molyneux appeals with triumph to Art. XVII., an article which is our property as well as his, and which, involving as it does, some of the most difficult points in divinity, he does not strike us as at all competent to interpret; but staring him in the face is Art. XVI., teaching doctrine contrary, not to Art. XVII., but to the couple of pages he has written upon the latter. Of this, however, as we have already said, he has taken no notice. Now we plead, not for Art.

XVI. *versus* Art. XVII., nor for Art. XVII. *versus* Art. XVI.; but for Articles XVI. and XVII. taken together.

To the Homilies, Mr. M. makes no reference whatever. We therefore content ourselves with saying, that they distinctly assert the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

We have confined ourselves, as we proposed at the outset, to the ecclesiastical question, not having leisure or space at present for the scriptural one, which, indeed, as far as anything novel or formidable in Mr. Molyneux's arguments is concerned, there is no great occasion for discussing. Our aim has been to show that, be the orthodox doctrine of Baptism true or false, the Clergy of the Church of England are committed to it; and that those who are offended with such Clergymen as preach it, are at issue not with them but with her. We have seen how poor a figure Mr. Molyneux makes when trying to torture her declarations into a sense favourable to his own opinions; how he has passed over some of the most important without notice; under what immense mistakes he has approached others; and how entirely one of them (that from the opening of the Catechism) refuses to submit to the process of evasion whereto he would subject it.

It would, however, be a serious thing were the Church of England and all her Clergy committed to a doctrine contrary to Scripture; and we rejoice in the assurance that this is not the case. Nothing that Mr. Molyneux has advanced has in any degree shaken our confidence here. In correcting one of his misapprehensions we have, as we remarked at the time, refuted nearly all his arguments from Scripture; and we now refer those of our readers to whom the subject may not be quite familiar, to Bishop Bethell's admirable work, if they would wish to see on what copious, what superabundant scriptural authority the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration reposes. To the same valuable treatise we must commend them for an explanation of St. John's language in his first epistle; a subject on which we intended entering ourselves, but from which we feel precluded by the length to which our remarks have gone already.

We have spoken severely of Mr. Molyneux, and we feel justified in doing so. Theological ignorance like his is surely a sin in a Clergyman; had he been self-distrustful and inquiring, he would not have been under the cloud which his diocesan has been reluctantly obliged to put over him,—the peace of his neighbourhood would not have been disturbed,—and his congregation would have received from him deeper and truer, because more scriptural, doctrine than they do at present.

The Unity of the Church, the Condition of the Conversion of the World; a Sermon preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, at the 141st Anniversary of the Society for the "Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," May 27, 1842. By the Right Rev. EDWARD DENISON, D. D. Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Prefixed to the Society's Report. 8vo. Pp. 21.

It is very remarkable how deficient we are either in Missionary records, or in books or even sermons, which place the obligation of

evangelizing heathen lands on the true ground. However, our neglects may well account for our silence. The history of English missions is the blankest page in our ecclesiastical annals. In the list of preachers before the Propagation Society, we find the name of Berkeley, whose attempted college in Bermuda was even a better evidence than his sermon, that he, at least, knew how the gospel ought to be propagated; but after him, Butler almost alone breaks the long mediocrity of results alike and motives, by anything like a reference "to the Catholic visible Church as the repository of the written oracles of God," (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 284,) and, by consequence, the sole commissioned originator of missionary schemes. Horsley, perhaps, is the other noblest name among nearly a century and a half of preachers; but his sermon is a tedious disquisition on the promise made to St. Peter. But if the Bishop of Salisbury has had so few predecessors who have distinguished themselves on this inspiring occasion, it is not too much to say, that, had even all our Fathers since 1702 (the first anniversary of the Society) understood, and, understanding, pressed with all their powers the true obligation and means toward the success of missions, none could in power and clearness have surpassed this year's preacher. Our Lord's last prayer was for unity;—the unity of the Church is the condition named by the Head of the Church for the conversion of the world; and not only this, but unity among ourselves is to the heathen to be the sign of our mission,—the pledge of our success in preaching the gospel. Hitherto we have not been one; the want of unity is the cause of the sterility of our missions. It is undeniable that our missions have produced very few fruits; hence we must, above all things, labour for unity, pray for it, and personally live obedient and holy lives, in order to win this long-absent blessing; and then, when we are one at home, and when all difficulties of communion with other branches of the Catholic Church are removed: and when other christian bodies are conformed to the apostolic discipline and pattern, the condition of unity being fulfilled, we may reckon upon the fulfilment of the promise: but to hasten His kingdom we must be one. Such is a meagre outline of this beautiful and, as it was delivered, most impressive sermon. Local subjects, and those of present and engrossing interest, are touched upon; and this on the same general principles as have been adopted by the Bishops of Oxford, Exeter, and Down; but in a tone which to us, though we may be prejudiced, sounds even more soothing, more paternal, more encouraging, and more catholic. We scarcely know what to extract; but as the discourse will soon be in all our readers' hands, we here rather desire to express our great gratitude and comfort in reading it.

"How different, again, would be the effect upon heathen nations, were Christianity presented to them in that harmonious development, in which it was set forth by the inspired followers of its divine Author, and all who bear the name of Christian were seen to be united in one faith and one worship! Instead of this, our present dissensions too often exhibit the nominal Church of Christ as a jarring assemblage of hostile sects, and thus divert the attention from the simplicity of truth to the complications of error; and distracting and confusing the mind with conflicting claims, either make an universal scepticism appear the sole refuge in the hopelessness of true judgment; or, at best, if some of the great doctrines of faith be embraced, deprive them of the support they were designed to receive from being incorporated in the visible institution of the Church as a living body."—Pp. 11, 12.

"It is easy to observe that a sense of this truth, which has too long lain dormant, has of late been extensively revived in various quarters. Whereas our branch of the Church has rested for generations complacent and self-satisfied in that separation from the rest of Christendom in which it has been placed by unhappy circumstances, there is now a growing feeling of dissatisfaction at this isolation, and an obvious yearning of men's minds after the long-lost blessing of spiritual communion." P. 12.

After alluding to and deploring our separation from the churches under the Roman obedience, and from those of the Eastern world, his lordship, in reference to the continental protestant bodies, says, with great truth—and we trust that these weighty words will have their due effect in all quarters, even in the very highest—

"But if, in relation to the Church of Rome, we saw reason to believe that some among ourselves were led so highly to estimate the order and constitution of the Church as to be almost blinded thereby to corruptions both of doctrine and practice, so we must not forget that there is a contrary extreme to this; and that there are both those by whom the mere negation of Romish error appears to be deemed almost more important than the essentials of Christian truth, and many more who, in their zeal for certain doctrinal verities, which they arbitrarily establish as comprising the sum and substance of Christianity, appear to know no other note of the true Church than that which consists in an agreement respecting these.

"We must, therefore, be on our guard against this extreme also; and be careful that, even in love and charity to others, we be not led into any act inconsistent with the distinctive character of our own Church. We will place no obstacle in the way of a lawful union with any members of the Christian family, who hold the doctrines of the faith in orthodoxy; nay, rather will we gladly cherish every approach thereto. But we will be careful that we do not, in seeking to anticipate the time of God's providence, act upon a hasty longing that will end in disappointment. The gift we have to communicate is too sacred to be made the subject of any doubtful or questionable dealing. It must be duly valued before it can be fitly disposed. It is not for those who are reluctant to receive it, or who view it as a thing indifferent. It depends upon 'the real state, and spirit, and character,' of any communion, whether it be a fit recipient of it, and into these, therefore, inquiry should be made. We must not, in trying to court others to accept at our hands that of which they stand in need, act or speak as though we did not rightly prize our own privileges. We must not commit our Church, or appear to commit her, to anything at variance with her own principles, lest, in too hastily seeking an unity which we may after all fail to obtain, we hinder and trouble that which it is our own fault if we do not enjoy."—Pp. 17, 18.

A Steam Voyage to Constantinople, by the Rhine and the Danube, in 1840-41; and to Portugal, Spain, &c. in 1839. By C. W. VANE, MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY, G.C.B. &c. To which is annexed the Author's Correspondence with Prince Metternich, Lords Ponsonby, Palmerston, &c.; in 2 vols. 8vo. London: Colburn. 1842.

THE interest which attaches to published Travels depends upon two circumstances—the nature of the country visited, and the qualifications of the person visiting, both as a traveller and a writer. As regards the former, though the ground traversed by Lord Londonderry is by no means new, it is yet sufficiently diversified to afford matter for an interesting work. Vienna and Constantinople, Athens and Naples, Palermo and Gibraltar, Lisbon and Seville, together

with the countries intervening, are enough, it must be owned, to fill two octavo volumes; and these were all visited by the noble Marquess in the two tours here described. Again, his style of writing is easy and unaffected. But what recommends these volumes most is the position occupied by the writer; by which we mean, not simply his rank and station in the peerage of England, but the European reputation which he had gained by his military and diplomatic services, which secured him access to sovereigns and their ministers. It would be impossible, of course, but that the brother of Lord Castlereagh, and the English ambassador at Vienna in 1815, should be favourably received at that court in 1841; and accordingly, the account of the veteran Metternich forms to our mind the most interesting feature in the book. The testimony of Lord Londonderry is also valuable in reference to the changes which six-and-twenty years have produced upon the continent of Europe. The king of Bavaria had the bad taste to refuse an audience to his former companion in arms on some petty ground of etiquette.

The tour first in order in these volumes, but in point of time two years later, was cut short at Palermo, by the arrival of the disastrous news of the loss of his Lordship's mansion in the county of Durham, by fire,—an event to which, we must do him the credit to say, he alludes with the expression of very right feeling. We are anxious to make this acknowledgment, for we must confess that we have not risen from the perusal of these volumes with an increased sense of the moral dignity of the writer. There is an appearance, perhaps, of vanity in the notice which he takes of certain insults offered to him by those who ought to have known better; but we believe it only to be an appearance; and we think that he has acted only with proper spirit and high moral courage, in making public the slights that he received from Lords Ponsonby and Howard de Walden. It appears that these functionaries were so strongly imbued with Whig principles that they could not bear the approach of one holding opposite sentiments; and moreover, feeling that their reign would be short, they had each retired from the capitals of the monarchs to whom they were respectively sent; and, leaving the concerns of their countrymen to chance, employed themselves in saving as much out of their official incomes as the time would allow. This might be prudent, but certainly it was not just. We do not therefore blame Lord Londonderry for insisting on the respect that was fairly due to him *from those who were in a condition to offer it*; but it does not impress us with the greatness of a person's mind to find him continually talking of creature-comforts, and lamenting their absence when not to be had. In fact, his Lordship appears to us a much more selfish person than we should have expected in the old soldier. Nevertheless, the volumes will do well for the Book-Club.

The National Psalmist, under the immediate sanction of H. R. H. Prince Albert, His Grace the Archbishop of York, the Professors in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and upwards of Three Thousand Nobility, Clergy, &c. By CHARLES DANVERS HACKETT. London: Simpkin and Marshall.

THIS is the somewhat pompous designation of a work now in course of publication, of which five parts have reached us. It contains, as far as already published, a collection of psalm-tunes original and selected, with a preface on the history and present state of psalmody. In the class of selections, we are glad to find a greater sprinkling than is common in such publications, of the old church tunes; and in the *original* department, we have, besides those of the Editor himself, a variety of compositions by Camidge, Crotch, Elvey, Horsley, Turler, Wesley, Novello, and other professional gentlemen of the present day, whose names are duly emblazoned in the title of the work: a display which we suppose is necessary now-a-days, in order to get a new work properly introduced to the notice of a "discerning public." We are inclined to say of the original as of the selected portion of this work, that, with some exceptions, the compositions are greatly above the average of what we meet with in such collections; and it is but just to say, that, throughout the whole, Mr. Hackett has shown his good taste and reverential feeling in avoiding those meaningless rants,* with which, under the name of Psalm tunes, our ears are so often and so painfully afflicted. Having said thus much in praise of the *National Psalmist*, we are bound to mention some things which greatly detract from its value. 1st. The music, though printed in score, (and handsomely printed too,) has, unhappily, the alto and tenor parts written in the G clef, according to a vicious system lately introduced. In a work of such pretensions, Mr. Hackett should not have descended to this, and we are sure that, with the increased attention now paid to vocal music and sight-singing, he need not have done it. 2d. We wish that the old church tunes had been really given in their original dress. Something certainly has been done by Mr. Hackett, towards bringing them back to their proper form, both by divesting the melodies of modern *improvements*, and also by restoring in part the older harmonies;† but still they are *not* as they appeared in the old collections of Ravenscroft and others; and, as we observed last month, they are in consequence far inferior in effect. Let these tunes be properly performed, according to the ancient arrangement, the *tenor* voices singing the *melody*, and the treble, alto, and bass sustaining their respective parts in the harmony, and we are much mistaken if they do not turn out to be both skilful and beautiful compositions. 3d. We must protest against the *words* which Mr. Hackett has adapted to the tunes, which are, for the most

* In Mr. Hackett's preface, we have some amusing notices of the airs (amorous and bacchanalian many of them) from which several of the tunes in common use are derived.

† See, for instance, Tallis's tune, commonly called the Evening Hymn, of which Mr. Hackett justly says that the outrageous corruptions which have been grafted upon it, render a return to the original absolutely necessary. For Tallis's *own* arrangement of the tune, however, see the volume noticed in our last number, *Sacred Music by Tallis, Tye, &c.* p. 16.

part, quite inadmissible. We know not where they all come from, but we can trace several of them to dissenting sources; and, at all events, there is no authority for their use, and generally they are very unfit company for the music, which it would have been much better to have printed alone. One other remark must be made. We cannot but regret the tendency which is fostered by such publications as the present, to undervalue, if not to supersede, the proper music of the Church,—the chant and anthem. Much is now done in the way of reviving attention to the music of the Church, but little comparatively, we are sorry to say, in the right direction. In the instance before us, we have 100 folio pages of metrical tunes alone; and though there is something said on the wrapper of “chants, &c.,” yet this is apparently but a make-weight, and not a word appears in the preface, which would so much as lead the reader to suppose that any music but the psalm-tune was provided for in the ritual of the Church. Certainly this is not putting things in their proper order. Another symptom of the same disposition is supplied by (what do our readers suppose?) an adaptation of part of Farrant’s anthem, “Lord, for thy tender mercies’ sake,” as a hymn-tune under the name of Tyre! Considering that this composition, in its proper form of *anthem*, is as simple and as easily sung as any thing can well be, it certainly argues an extraordinary preference for metrical psalmody, when we find it thus pressed into service, merely for the purpose of swelling a number of tunes already too large. We are quite content that the old metrical tunes should be retained, *along* with our old chants and anthems, provided always that these are not thereby superseded. And we hinted, on a former occasion, a special reason why it is well that they *should* be retained, even though the service of the English Church, as at present authorized by the rubric, is complete without the addition.—See *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. iii. p. 694, note.

Romantic Biography of the Age of Elizabeth; or Sketches of Life from the Bye-ways of History. By WILLIAM COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. &c., Author of the “*Natural History of Society*,” &c. London: Bentley. 2 vols. 8vo. 1842.

IF Dr. Taylor had called this work “the Romance of History,” he would have chosen a better title. *Romancing* is a word well understood in our language, and exactly characterizes his performance. For the duties of a biographer he is eminently unfitted; first, because, either from ignorance or malice, he falsifies all history; and secondly, because he is quite incapable of entering into the characters of those concerning whom he writes. We propose, as shortly as may be, just to furnish proofs of these two statements, and shall then dismiss Dr. Taylor, never, we hope, to meet him again in the field of history or biography.

1. Two instances of misstatement, selected purposely, in matters of common notoriety, will suffice to establish the first position. 1. One of Dr. Taylor’s chapters has for its title “Archbishop Whitgift and Dr. Cartwright,” and has for its object the injuring the memory of the former. For this purpose he represents the archbishop as instigated by a personal hatred of his former fellow-collegian; and leaves the

reader to infer that that hatred was perpetuated even to the death of Cartwright in prison. To say that this is a falsification of fact, is of course only to say what is known to the veriest tyro in history. It is matter of common notoriety that Cartwright was reconciled to the Church before his death; and it is especially recorded by Collier that "the archbishop solicited the queen in his behalf, procured him his liberty, and her majesty's pardon;" and afterwards that "the queen was not pleased with his being so much considered, and thought that the archbishop had gone too far *in his good nature*; in return for which Cartwright treated the archbishop with a suitable regard, and continued quiet and inoffensive to his death, which happened about ten years after." 2. The other instance which we shall mention is found in the life of Calvin; representing him to have taken Holy Orders before the commencement of his erratic career, whereas the fact of his holding benefices without ordination has been again and again quoted in proof of the laxity of Church-discipline prevalent at that time. So much for the accuracy of Dr. Taylor's historical knowledge.

II. But what unfits him even more for the office of a biographer is the uniformly low view which he entertains of human nature. He seems unable to believe that any one can act on other than base motives. This is not owing to any prejudices, either religious or political; for all persons fare alike at his hands. Calvin and Whitgift, Laud and Jewel, are alike honoured with his abuse: the only exception that we have met with from this general law is in favour of the present Archbishop of Dublin. Now, we hold it indispensable to the biographer, that he should be able so far to throw himself into the views and feelings of the person whose life he is writing, as to give him credit for sincerity of motives: this is only the part of candour.

Further; Dr. Taylor has not only a sceptical, but also an irreverent and vulgar tone of mind, which is peculiarly offensive. What will the reader think of these passages? "Protestantism greatly increased the respectability of the devil: it supplied him with a longer 'tail' of followers than the policy or vanity of Daniel O'Connell collected *on* (sic) the first Reformed Parliament." "It is no easy matter to get up a perfectly new cry; there is danger of some explanation being required: but an old cry, such as 'No heresy!' or 'No popery!' has the stamp of old currency upon it, and gets rapidly into unquestioned circulation."

We regret to observe that some of Dr. Taylor's writings are on the list of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. We do not profess to have looked at more than these two volumes: but his views are so universally latitudinarian and defective, and the tone of his mind altogether so un-Churchmanlike, that we feel sure that he cannot be deserving the patronage or the confidence of the venerable Society.

Forest Life. By the Author of "*A New Home.*" 2 vols. 12mo. London: Longman & Co. 1842.

IN noticing Mrs. Clavers' former work we suggested that it was worth reprinting in England; and we presume that she has acted on

that hint in the new one, which we now introduce to our readers. The first volume of "Forest Life" we consider to be superior to the "New Home;" it contains some very graphic and humorous descriptions, and some very sound sentiments: in the second, the interest is scarcely maintained. Some persons, it is possible, may be scandalized at the freedom of the language used; it is well, therefore, that they should know beforehand what to expect. The book is something in the style of "Sam Slick," but less coarse. The best sketch is that of the Margold family; the one which we give below approaches more nearly to an average specimen.

"Here we found our gentleman in conversation with the landlord, who was, with all his odd roughness, a very civil sort of man, and very fond of hearing himself talk, although he had shown so little patience with our prolixity. He seemed to be warmly engaged in arguing with Mr. Sibthorpe on some point connected with the vexed question of distinctions in society.

"'Respect!' he exclaimed; 'why should I show more respect to any man than he shows to me? Because he wears a finer coat? his coat don't do me any good. Does he pay his taxes better than I do? Is he kinder to his family? Does he act more honestly by his neighbours? Will he have a higher place in heaven than I shall? Show me the man that's a better man than I am, and you'll see if I don't treat him with respect! But to fawn and cringe before a fellow-critter, because he's got more money than I have, is agin my principles. I shan't help to blow up nobody's pride.'

"'But,' persisted Mr. Sibthorpe, waiving however the main question, *as one must always do in such cases*, 'are you sure that it is not your own pride that makes the difficulty? Otherwise, what could be easier than to mark those different grades in society which have been always marked since the beginning of time; and in all probability will continue to be so long as earth endures, in spite of the resistance of those who are unwilling to foster any body's pride but their own?'

"'Ah, stop a little,' rejoined the landlord, 'there's where you go too far! You think these ranks and distinctions will go on always, because you wish they should go on. I believe they are coming to an end as fast as the earth rolls round. In my opinion, this eternal Yankee nation has set the example to all the rest of the world; and before many years is gone by, there won't be a man in England that'll take off his hat to the queen, unless she makes her manners first. All men—and women too—was born not only free, but equal; and equal they've got to be, on earth as well as in heaven.'

"'Well,' said Mr. Sibthorpe, with his usual good humour, 'I am glad to have met at last with *one* consistent American. You believe in the equal rights of all human beings. You are not for exalting one class of men at the expense of another, or depressing any class that another may live in pride and luxury at their expense.'

"'No, indeed,' said our host, with a virtuous severity depicted in his countenance. 'Give every man a fair chance, that's what I say, and then we can see what stuff he's made of. Outside ain't nothing.'

"'You are not one of those,' continued Mr. Sibthorpe, 'who would shut a man out from all the privileges of society, because God has given him a black skin. You would look only at his worth, his abilities, or his piety; you would be willing to associate with him, and assist him in maintaining his just natural rights, in spite of a cruel prejudice.'

"'What upon airth are you talking about?' exclaimed our host, quite aghast at this sweeping conclusion. 'I should ra'ally be glad to know if you mean to insult me! Are you a talking of niggers? Do you suppose I look upon a nigger as I do upon a white man? Do you think I am sich a fool as not to know what the Africans is? Should I put myself on an equality with the seed of Cain, that was done over black to show that they was to be sarvants, and the sarvants of sarvants? I'm not an abolitionist, thank God! and if you're one, the sooner you get back to your own country, the better.'

"'I have not been long enough in your land of liberty,' said Mr. Sibthorpe, with a quiet smile, 'to have enrolled myself under any of your party banners. I only wished to ascertain how far you carried your creed of equality; and I find you draw

the line, like most of your countrymen, just where your interest or your inclinations indicate. I can now see very plainly why you think there ought to be no distinction of ranks in the world! And, without waiting for the angry reply which seemed labouring in the mind of the landlord, Mr. Sibthorpe bade good night, and desired to be shown his room.

"What prejudiced critters these English is!" said our host, as he left the room."

The account which our authoress gives of the district schools in the United States, which it has been the fashion of the Edinburgh Review, and others of that party, to cry up as models for England, is miserable in the extreme.

Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland: being Sermons and Discourses selected from the Works of eminent Divines, who lived during the 17th Century. By JAMES BROGDEN, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge. 3 vols. 8vo. London. J. Murray. 1842.

THIS work differs in plan from Dr. Wordsworth's "Christian Institutes" only in this—that, instead of forming arbitrary divisions as "evidences of religion," "principles of government," &c., it so far follows the order of the Prayer-book, as to make it ever the text-book of the discourse. In other respects, the two works exactly agree: they are selected from the same class of writers, and both give complete treatises. The existence of the one, however, by no means renders the other superfluous. No one, who is at all acquainted with the richness of Anglican divinity, can suppose it to have been exhausted in four volumes. The two compilers, in fact, appear very rarely to have clashed. Sincerely, therefore, do we thank Mr. Brogden for this undertaking: whoever facilitates the study of the "divines of the seventeenth century" is a public benefactor.

So much for the general object and features of the work: as to details, there is room, of course, for some difference of opinion. To us there appears a want of definiteness in some few of the writers. We question, for example, if Bishop Hacket be the soundest expositor of the doctrine of the sacraments, or if Bishop Hall's views of the "Catholic Church" represent most faithfully our Anglican theology: even Pearson in this place is not free from objection, his design being rather to exhaust the subject, than to give a compendious summary.

But we will not find fault. Our wish is to encourage, not to criticize. We trust that Mr. Brogden may be induced to continue his labours through the remainder of the volume he has begun to "illustrate:" the divines of the seventeenth century would furnish the best commentary upon the Thirty-nine Articles. Or we should gladly see extracted from their writings a brief explanation of doctrinal terms. Books of reference of this kind are peculiarly wanted at the present time.

A Charge delivered at the Ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester, in July, 1842. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, M. A. Archdeacon of Chichester. Murray. 1842. 8vo. Pp. 51.

ARCHDEACON Manning is so well and favourably known to all sincere Churchmen, that it might have seemed sufficient to announce the publication of his recent Charge. But there is one point to which we wish to call attention, which is, the proper nature of an archdeacon's charge. We hold that these very important officers of the Church greatly transcend their functions when they meddle with doctrine and controversy; especially when they make the archdeacon's chair the opportunity of vilifying their brethren, their co-presbyters,—or when they take upon themselves magisterially to decide upon theological subjects, questioned and questionable. Let them remember that they are not bishops. *Oculus Episcopi, manus Episcopi, os Episcopi*, if you will, but not *auctoritas Episcopi*. Often when we have been compelled to listen to a long tedious archidiaconal charge, floundering through every controversy of the day, settling this and deciding that, dogmatizing and pronouncing even upon the principles of the faith with all the dignity of a general council, we are tempted to say, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?" We often wonder that some of the archdeacons, instead of examining the roofs and pews, do not ask for the incumbent's last fifty-two sermons. Questions of law—the decencies of public service—church rates—tithes—societies—collections—these, subjects which we can well spare in "the godly admonitions" of our ghostly Fathers in God, ought to form the staple of an archdeacon's advice and instruction.

Now, Archdeacon Manning studiously keeps to his office,—he never intrudes upon episcopal functions: not that he is not eminently qualified to debate controversial points; but he avails himself, and most properly, of other channels than his ordinary visitations to discuss christian doctrine, except in that indirect and assumed way in which every, even the minutest, integral of the Church system may be so treated, as to bear its own, and, because unexpected, most forcible witness to Catholic truth.

Although elsewhere we have thought it our duty to differ, and that on serious questions, from the Camden Society, we are at one with them in their crusade against pews. Let us hear the Archdeacon of Chichester:—

"It is well known that three hundred years ago the whole area of our Churches, with few and slight exceptions, was open and free to all; the only exceptions were seats of which the private and permanent use was assigned by the Bishop, or, in other words, by a faculty. The whole area of the Church was common to all parishioners, and very significantly shadowed forth the unity and the equality of all members in the mystical body of Christ. It was a pathetic witness against the self-elevation and self-preference of one above another, a rebuke of the exacting vigilance of private rights, and a manifestation that in Christ all things are united; that in Him there is "neither bond nor free;" that the mysteries of creation and regeneration are laws alike to all. There was a deep moral and spiritual meaning lying hid in this internal order of the Church of Christ; and not only so, it was a most wholesome and subduing discipline to the minds of those who, by their wealth or rank without the walls of the Church, might be tempted, to their own great spiritual

hurt, to carry the same bearing and temper into it. From time to time—be it for ever so short a season—all men were reminded of their natural equality, and of their equal need of one and the same atoning sacrifice. Separate seats were permitted only in cases of such peculiar exemptions as could not be drawn into precedent, *e. g.*, to the lord of the soil, to the patron, or to some great benefactor of the particular Church; and the exemption could be made by no one but the Bishop alone. The whole of the remaining space was free for the common use of the parishioners, subject to the disposal of the churchwardens. And so long as this disposing power was real and not nominal, there was no confusion, no strife, no litigation, but order and certainty, and a fitting arrangement of the parishioners, according as they and their families had need.”—Pp. 11-13.

“The truth must be told. Pews are a strong abuse, a triumphant usurpation, fenced about by the difficulties and costs of obtaining a legal remedy. Private rights have no place in the freehold of God. It is against Him we commit the trespass.”—P. 17.

“I will remind you of a plea often put forward even by right-minded persons—that pews are a means of privacy, and, therefore, of devotion. Now, I would have all such persons to consider whether it be wholesome and sound to train their devotional habits upon a support which is peculiar to the richer among us—whether, in reality, the true and living devotion be not rather that of the poor man, who, with no such refined and sickly helps to devotion, worships God in His house with open face?

“And again, it is to be remembered that privacy is the very plea that, beyond all extenuation, condemns the use of pews. Privacy in our own closet is intelligible, but it is a contradiction in terms to talk of privacy in public worship: too often it is a proof that we have got no further than private and individual acts of prayer; that common, united worship is an idea too broad, too high, and too heavenly for the narrow and isolating turn of our popular religion.”—P. 21.

Equally wise and kind are the good archdeacon's recommendations of the offertory:—

“It seems perfectly obvious that the great works in which the Church as a body is engaged, can never be permanently and certainly maintained by the contributions of a class or a section of her members, but only by the oblations of the whole Church: first, then, any scheme of forming a revenue must be not partial, but universal: in the next place, it is plain that the smallness and inadequacy of the means now at the disposal of the Church arises in great measure from the fact that most people contribute on no fixed principle, by no relative measure, in no definite proportion to the means entrusted to their stewardship; for this reason, any such scheme must proceed upon the principle of making proportionate offerings to God's service: and lastly, the duty of giving for the work of Christ, through His Church, must be no longer severed from the offices and the sacred associations of divine worship. To lay by portions of our substance for the service of God—say one-fourth, one-sixth, one-tenth, &c.—is as much a part of Christianity as any evangelical precept; and it is only when viewed and done in its relation to our acts of grateful homage, that the practice of giving for religious works receives its full meaning and sacredness. Where, then, shall we find a principle which shall be universal in its extent, containing in itself the law of proportionate oblations, and interwoven with our acts of worship? Nowhere else than in the Apostle's precept, ‘Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him;’ or, in other words, in the offertory of the Church.”—Pp. 29, 30.

“We must protest against the privilege of alms-giving being made a refinement of the rich: we must take up a plea for the poor man, and claim for him the restoration of his birthright, to give for Christ's sake, and to be blessed in his deed. The keenest and the highest feelings of his nature are left unawakened, so long as we keep back from him the mystery of the fellowship of saints; the universal sympathy of the members of Christ; the communion of sorrow, and sufferings, and prayers, and consolations, and alms; the warfare of the Church; its strife against the spiritual evil of relapsed Christians in its own bosom, and its toil among the heathen nations of the world.”—Pp. 32, 33.

We would willingly go on, but space forbids. We recommend the Charge heartily.

A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of the East Riding at their Ordinary Visitation. By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, M.A. Archdeacon of the East Riding, &c. York. Sunter. 8vo. Pp. 23.

WHAT we have said of Archdeacon Manning and his charge, applies, almost *totidem verbis*, to Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce, who is running the same useful course in the East Riding of Yorkshire. His suggestions are stamped with the same consciousness of his position, the same mild yet forcible and dignified character, and, above all, with the same practical value. He writes, as one who had tried and profited by all that he asks others to do. If we might venture upon a comparison which may seem offensive, we should say that the moral cuticle of our brethren in the north is somewhat thicker than that of the Sussex Clergy. At any rate, they seem to require admonitions, which to sound Churchmen ought to be—would that they were!—superfluous. Catechizing seems to be much neglected; hence the need of advising, not increased attention to the ordinance, but, its use at all. The more frequent celebration of the Eucharist follows, on which we gladly extract p. 9.

“It was little, therefore, to sweep away private masses, without bringing back the public Eucharist. The object of the Reformers was not merely to extinguish superstition, but to rekindle piety. ‘Our Church,’ says Bishop Beveridge, ‘requireth, or at least, supposeth the Holy Communion to be administered every Lord’s day and every holiday throughout the year, as it was in the primitive Church; for that is the reason that the communion service is appointed to be read upon all such days, and to be read at the communion table, that so the minister may be there ready to administer it to all those that desire to partake of it.’

“I pause to express my hope, that, unless unavoidably prevented, you all comply with this last order of the Church, and offer up the communion service at the communion table. The point might seem immaterial, but for the reason which Bishop Beveridge suggests, that the Church’s service is imperfect unless crowned by that Eucharistic offering whereby we enter into union with Christ our Lord. And in a positive institution like the Church of Christ, no one can calculate the full consequence of deserting the rule of order and the practice of his brethren. It is from no groundless jealousy, therefore, that the rulers of our Church have lately inhibited all capricious derelictions of established usage. Suppose that the novel custom complained of be, that a company of singers is allowed to enter within the altar rails, or that the Lord’s table is employed when names are to be inscribed in the register-books. Some may pronounce this a matter of indifference, and may distinguish, as was done of old, between the altar and the gift which was upon it. But the Church’s command for setting apart the Holy Table, and for its seclusion from all profane uses, is conclusive, of itself, against such indecent innovations. And to those who look deeply into the matter, their mischievous effect is sufficiently manifest. ‘The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper,’ to quote again from Bishop Beveridge, ‘being the highest mystery in all our religion, that place where this sacrament was administered was always made and reputed the highest place in the Church.’ Now, can men feel towards it in this way, who, when they enter God’s house, think the Lord’s table the fittest place on which to deposit their superfluous garments? Is it a seemly use of God’s board to employ it as a writing-table? These remarks have been suggested by complaints made to me respecting the irreverence which in some places has been allowed to gain head. They will deserve especial attention in the Parochial Visitations, which, God willing, I shall make during the present summer. God forbid, indeed, that I should suppose such irreverence general. But where it has appeared, what wonder if faith has grown cold; if men have first disbelieved and then forsaken the sacraments; if the promises annexed to our public worship, and the sacredness of

our ministers, are alike forgotten; if men have been satisfied with appearing once a-year at the holy table, and that rather as notifying their own profession than from any true 'discerning of the Lord's body?'—P. 9—11.

"Again, observe its absolute necessity for our brethren's welfare. The Holy Communion is the grand means of union with Christ our Lord. That we cannot serve God of ourselves is manifest; we need His grace. And His grace is given to men not as individuals, but as members of that mystical body, which the twelve gathered together in His name. For this body our Lord especially prayed; it inherited those encouragements and assurances, which were given to the Apostles. Now it is by Holy Communion, that men are members of this mystic body. As they are admitted to it by one sacrament, so is their union cemented by the other. Therefore does the English Church teach us to thank God for the Lord's Supper, 'in that He doth thereby assure us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son.' In short, unless men are habitual communicants, they have no claim to be called Christians. Other means are useful in their way, but this is essential. For what gives to other ordinances their effect is, that those who participate in them are members of Christ, and Church-membership is bestowed through the Lord's Supper. Prayer and preaching are not effectual through their own vigour, but because they can claim the fulfilment of those promises, of which by communion with Christ men are inheritors."—P. 13.

We close with a beautiful and forcible peroration—alas! that it should be needful!

"And this is the great reason for regretting that those rules for our guidance which the Church has embodied in the Prayer-book, are so imperfectly observed. Were it only that we lose an argument which might tell upon our lay brethren, and can expect from them little deference for a rule of which we are ourselves unmindful, this were, no doubt, to be lamented. Yet is this a small thing compared with the practical loss under which we suffer. By bringing before us a course of daily worship,—by associating the several seasons of the year with those great events which ended in the establishment of the Church, and which form the central point in the world's history,—by prescribing seasons of peculiar humiliation and self-denial,—our formularies are calculated to infuse that devotional spirit, which God's grace only can give, but which is not to be expected except in an habitual use of the ordinances of His worship. If this were needful even for Apostles, if they found it essential to give themselves to prayer as well as to the ministry of the word, then cannot these laws, as inscribed in our Church's statute-book, be judged superfluous. What effect might follow if they were better observed, if the Clergy were again intercessors for the people in the full manner which the Prayer-book contemplates,—what blessing we might expect from Him who answers prayer, and is present in our public solemnities, what advantages we should gain for our congregations, what solace in our own hearts, I will not at present observe. I take lower ground. I confine myself to a more restricted object. I ask you, once a month, at all events, to give your people the opportunity of sacramental union with Christ. I entreat you to impress upon them its necessity. I beg that you will give to the season of Lent, at least, that decent observance which your promises demand, which your situation makes so important. Let the Church's protest on Ash-Wednesday be no longer unheard. Let its meaning be enforced and illustrated. So shall we be freed from the blood of souls, and acquit our own consciences in the day of judgment."—Pp. 22, 23.

By the way, it seems but a small thing, but we are delighted at the price of this Charge—threepence. If Churchmen and publishers could but tell the incalculable benefit of cheap publications, they would go upon a very different plan. The better a book or a pamphlet is, the dearer it is. The publications of Parker, of Oxford, and Rivington, yes, and of our own respectable publisher too, are far too dear. We are glad to find, however, that this evil is in a fair way of being remedied.

A Letter to the Rev. Edward B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford; being a Vindication of the Tenets and Character of the Wesleyan Methodists against his Misrepresentations and Censures. By THOMAS JACKSON. Mason, Wesleyan Conference Office, 14, City Road. 8vo. pp. 110.

As was to have been expected, the Methodists are in fearful wrath at the recent exposures of the rottenness of their system, and of their complete abandonment of the principles of him whose name they bear. Dr. Pusey's allegation of heresy appears to have nettled them most. *Hæret lateri lethalis arundo*. It seems to us to come to this—that their system and that of the Romanists is morally the same. In either case, the theoretical teaching is one thing, their practical application of it another. It has been always held a good argument against Rome to say, "It may be all very true that you do not formally and in terms recommend, or even countenance, the worship of the Blessed Virgin; but is it not a fact that your people do substitute the Mother of God for the Saviour Himself?" So say we of the Methodists;—it is of no use to quote Wesley's sermons; we care nothing for what Mr. Thomas Jackson chooses to tell us of the doings in the City Road, which may be true or not;—the fact is, talk to the Methodists, and you will find out in five minutes that they identify the gift of justification with that personal act of the will, instigated by fancy or feeling, or what not, which wishes, or thinks about, or, as it is technically phrased, *apprehends*, the sufferings of Christ. Justification with them is not so much the incorporation into the communion of saints, which is the Saviour's body, as a private emotion. And this doctrine is a "degenerating into developed heresy." Luther invented it, and his followers, we suppose that Mr. Thomas Jackson may happen to have heard, ended in denying the Saviour. Is not the case of Dr. Adam Clarke one in point? And we do not scruple to say that, wherever this doctrine is held, in the Church or out of it, men are in that course, by which, if other obstacles, such as the liturgy, &c. do not intervene, they will be landed in the same slough. It is high time to declare that the great bulk of those who hold the doctrine of justification by faith only, in the sense in which Methodists understand it, are rationalists, whether they know it or not. It is curious to see how Mr. Jackson, and we suppose that he is somebody in authority among these people, is puzzled to know what to call them. Sometimes they are "Societies;" then they are "Mr. Wesley's Societies;" then "Wesleyans;" then "Methodists;" then "the Wesleyan body;" then "Mr. Wesley's followers;" or the "people to whom the name Wesleyan is applied;" but whether they claim to belong to the One Holy Catholic Church, or whether they form one church complete in itself—*totus in se teres atque rotundus*—or whether they are dissenters, or whether something made up of each and all of these, we are not told, simply because the writer cannot make out. The pamphlet before us is heavy and ill-tempered, and badly written. There are some rather curious stories afloat about defections, which are or were on the eve of taking place in the very highest places of this hybrid body; but either time will show, or bribery has settled this matter;—at least, so the tale runs.

Holy Scripture, the Ultimate Rule of Faith to a Christian Man.
By the Rev. W. FITZGERALD, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.
Seeley and Burnside. 1842. 12mo. Pp. 213.

THIS book shows that its author, unlike the methodists, is not degenerating into heresy, but, is a confirmed heretic. In recommending the modern dogma of the sole sufficiency of Scripture, unregulated by Catholic tradition, he thinks proper to patronize not only the semi-Arians and Eusebians, but, indirectly, Arius himself. His "own opinion is, that some of the ante-Nicene writers held a real temporary generation of the Son of God; i.e. a temporary *προβολή* from the substance of the Father, whereby a new person, or individual subsistence, was produced." And so, consistently enough, he takes Bull, Grabe, and Waterland to task repeatedly, and, as he supposes, very effectively; all which, in the Irish B.A., we consider great insolence and presumption.

Truth on both Sides; or, Can the Believer finally Fall? By
STAFFORD BROWN, M.A. Perpetual Curate of Christ Church,
Derry Hill, Wilts. Hatchard. Pp. 268.

THIS is a very temperate inquiry into a very delicate subject—that of final perseverance in the elect. Mr. Brown thinks that he can make out a consistent system from conflicting views of the indefectibility of grace on the one hand, and of free-will on the other; that he can reconcile, without impinging on universalism, the certainty of God's promises, with the avowed possibility of falling away from grace given; in a word, that there is "truth on both sides;" that controversialists always carry matters too far, and that their statements combined with those of their opponents usually make up the truth. That there is some modicum of verisimilitude, though not of verity in this, we are prepared to admit; but we hesitate as much about adopting his conclusion, as we distrust the soundness of the principle by which Mr. Brown conducts his inquiry: viz. that the sense of Scripture may be arrived at by individual prayer. And, of course, we demur to the assertion, chap. vi., that "a view cannot be wrong which has been held by so many good men." However, we cheerfully admit that we feel very kindly towards the author, who, judging from his book, is a very amiable, if not deep, man. Such gentleness, and the wish to see good and truth in the most opposite statements, is very comforting and thankworthy in these days of asperity and evil speaking. The following is a fair specimen of Mr. Brown's style, which is somewhat wire-drawn, as well as his matter.

"Again, let us say, the more the believer fears, the more he needs comfort; and the less he fears, the more he needs caution. When we will not be comforted, we most of all require the promises to uphold us; and when we cannot bear to think of danger, oh! then, indeed, we need a warning. Fear, without confidence, will make us cowards; confidence, without fear, will make us vain boasters. If we have nothing but fear, we shall be taken captive by the demon of despair. If we have nothing but confidence, we may be thrown down by the evil angel of pride and false

security. Confidence sleeps in safety when fear is on the watch ; but if the watch is away, or wrapt in slumbers, to dream on in fancied security, is a folly which must suffer loss. * * * Thus unsightly are both in disunion ; thus lovely are they as companions in the palace of one heart."—Pp. 263—265.

A Collection of Ancient Church Music, printed by the Motett Society.
Part I.

WE beg our readers' pardon (and the Motett Society's at the same time) for not having announced this publication in our last number. We are happy to find that its appearance has not disappointed the expectations which had been formed of it : eighty-four pages of the finest ecclesiastical music, adapted in every respect for the service of the English Church, is an earnest of the boon which this Society is likely to confer upon our cathedral and parochial churches, by its much-needed publications. The part before us contains the commencement of a series, which, we need hardly say, was heretofore an acknowledged desideratum, viz. a course of Anthems for the commemorations of the Church throughout the year. We have here eight of these, for the festivals from Advent to Innocents' Day inclusive : and the Second Part (which we hear is now in the press) is intended to embrace the festivals and fasts from Circumcision to Easter. Of those already printed, too much can hardly be said in praise of the selection of music, as well as the adaptation of words—with perhaps one exception—the Motett for St. Thomas's Day. We would rather not have had the Collect used as the anthem. There seems no valid objection, indeed, to Collects, as such, being set to music ; but they should be such as can be used on other occasions than the days on which they are appointed to be read. The one before us could not be used as an ordinary anthem with any propriety, while it would be very awkward, too, if used as the anthem on St. Thomas's day, when the same words have occurred immediately before. Besides the festival anthems, this Part contains eleven miscellaneous anthems of equal merit with the former class.

We subjoin the following extract from the Advertisement prefixed to the present Part, for the benefit of all whom it may concern :—

"As an unexpected delay has taken place in the appearance of the First Part, and as many persons became early Subscribers on the understanding that the publication would appear at the end of last year, the Committee intend that the subscription shall now reckon from the date of this notice ; so that Subscribers will receive, for their first year's payment, all the works issued by the Society up to May, 1843. The Committee believe that their undertaking is not yet so extensively known as is desirable ; and also, that many persons have waited for the appearance of the First Part before subscribing, in order to form a better judgment of the plan and contents of the publication ;—they propose, therefore, to keep the subscription-list open, on the present terms, until the close of the first year ; after which, those who wish to possess the parts issued previously to their subscription, will be charged at the rate of Two Guineas per annum."

"Boeckh's Public Economy of Athens," translated by Mr. Cornwall Lewis, (Parker,) has been so long before the learned world that it is sufficient to mention the publication of a second, and in appearance, a much improved edition. Though in its way a useful, it always struck us as a very heavy, and, in every sense, German work ; but how far we were biassed by undergraduate tendencies to idleness, it boots not to inquire.

The same spirit of fatigue came over us at the sight of a translation of "Rotteck's General History of the World." (Longman.) Four volumes, ranging from the creation to the year 1840, may be deemed apology sufficient for an editor, in hot weather, honestly to avow that he has not read them through. Let it be understood, however, that we have seen enough of the book to assure our readers that its author is a rationalist of the extreme development,—that he coolly talks of the fables which Moses introduced into the Pentateuch,—and that he is the unblushing apologist of Mahommedanism, at least one awful shadow of Antichrist. *Quousque tandem?* "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge?"

A very reasonable pamphlet, "The Dress of the Clergy," (Painter,) has appeared. It is written, not only in a sober judicious way, but with sufficient research. We have heard, and find no reason to question the truth of the report, that the Bishop of the most important English diocese, has intimated his willingness to sanction the exclusive use of the surplice in sacred ministrations, as soon as a body of the clergy sufficient in numbers and character signify their wishes on this head. One of our greatest defects is this unwillingness to communicate our feelings to each other; and we lack rather unity of operation than unity of purpose. By the way, we are glad to find the excellent Bishop of Down and Connor desiring his clergy to preach in the surplice. With respect to the out-door dress, we deprecate the assumption of it by individuals without authority. We have not forgotten the appearance of an outlandish gaberdine at a late Oxford convocation: a more absurd instance of private judgment we never saw. What was our consternation, when we saw this strange thing re-appear in Regent-street one hot day, a month or two ago! One reason which the author of the present little book gives for the adoption of his scheme, seems to us superfluous. "At the meetings of societies, the Clergymen would not be confounded with the dissenting speakers." p. 15. What business has a Clergyman, where he is likely to come in contact with these people?

From the same publisher has arrived "Statistics of Dissent," reprinted from some newspaper. If the facts can be relied upon, they may be useful; but we have not much sympathy with the writer's tone; we suspect him to be deficient in true Church principles: the book is something in the way of the earlier editions of "Essays on the Church." Now and then we hear of "Dissenting chapels:" this should always stand "meeting-houses:" and to talk of the "Dissenting minister at, &c." is monstrous. Nor can we quite understand, how there can be any doubt about Rowland Hill's "chapel" over Blackfriars-bridge being other than a dissenters' meeting-house. We might have been spared the nonsense about the "mild spirit and christian philanthropy" of some *Reverend* schismatics in Mary-le-bone, and the "respect and good feeling to the Clergy of the Church of England uniformly," evinced by the canonized Mr. Jay of Bath, (see *Christian Remembrancer*, May, 1841,) and the personal information about the "minister of Hare-street chapel," who was "thirty years a tallow-chandler in Bethnal-green."

We have to protest against a practice, now growing too common, of printing short-hand reports of Bishops' Charges in the public newspapers. Not only is it disrespectful to the Bishop personally, and irreverent to his office, but it is unfair in every way, for it makes the Bishops accountable for what most likely they never said. An instance occurs while we are writing: a report is published, purporting to be the Charge of the Bishop of Worcester; which it is quite impossible, we argue of course from internal evidence only, that his Lordship ever delivered. We had far rather imagine, that it is a playful invention of the *Record*, than that which it pretends to be. So, at least, we may say, till we see an authentic publication of the Charge itself.

We content ourselves, at present, with announcing Archdeacon Manning's "Treatise on the Unity of the Church." (Murray.) Embracing, as such a work must do, the nicest and most questionable points, it will receive such a notice in our pages as its importance demands. Upon our own mind, a very cursory perusal was productive of the most lively gratitude. Emphatically it

is a most heartening book; and written with that implicit confidence in the strength of our position as a Church, which, more than any work we ever read, will tend to settle the young and unsettled.

A delightful book has been published by Van Voorst, and it is not this publisher's first contribution to the study of Natural History treated in a genial, and, what we fear is rare in this class of works, other than irreverent tone. We allude to Mr. N. B. Ward, "On the Growth of Plants in closely Glazed Cases." None but poor wights, in "populous cities pent," can duly appreciate the freshness to the wearied spirit, the comfort to the aching eye, which is derived from the soft green healthy ferns and lichens which, in the smokiest dens of London, may be made by Mr. Ward's simple and delightful plan to flourish vigorously for years in these portable green-houses. Nor is this treatment of the most costly seeds and plants less noticeable on another ground. In the glazed boxes recommended by Mr. Ward, the most valuable tropical plants have been transported and reared when all other modes of culture had failed. We recommend this work heartily.

We propose to call attention to "The Rise of the Old Dissent exemplified in the Life of Oliver Heywood," by Mr. Joseph Hunter, (Longman,) in another form. Old dissent and new dissent, it seems, are very different things; and though we are not partial to puritanism,—far from it,—Mr. Hunter tells us that new dissent is ten thousand times worse. And we take his word for it, since he ought to know, being a dissenter himself.

We do not avow exact concurrence with every word of a "Letter to Lord Wharncliffe, on his late Declaration with Respect to National Education," by Tenax, (Tyas,) but we do say that it contains some excellent plain truth plainly put. Every word tells. We are not sure that a good many of us have not been saying as a friend said to Tenax, "I much fear lest the Church should be in greater danger from her professing friends than from her open and avowed enemies; it is far better to meet a bold and open and honest enemy, than a masked friend, using your own weapons in treachery against you." —p. 9.

And now that, contrary to our wont, we have begun to "talk politics," as the odd phrase runs, we may mention that a pamphlet has just appeared, "Guilty, or not Guilty, being an Inquest on the Conservative Ministry and Parliament." (Rivington.) *Felo de se* and the cross road would be our award; but the Church surely has had enough of leaning on Egypt. Our pamphleteer is a right-principled and right-thinking man, but we fear that the materials out of which right acting may be expected are in the case of our governors sufficiently intractable. Lord Wharncliffe's speech, above alluded to, is just as bad as, nay worse than, anything the Whigs ever said.

The "Catechism of Puseyism," (Hatchard and Seeley, 1842,) is one of those disgraceful publications, the influence of which it is the purpose of the tract, "Plain Words to Plain People," noticed in our last, (and which is, we understand, circulating very largely,) to counteract. We almost owe an apology to our readers for calling their attention to such things, except on the principle of labelling "Poison" on cheap and accessible drugs. It is enough to say that this "Catechism" (what a miserable profanation of a word dear to every Christian!) contains the avowal of every possible heresy, and the denial of every distinctive mark of the Church. And it is instructive, however painful, to find the opponents of Catholic truth, while raking over every dust-heap for testimonies and protests against "Puseyism," as they call it, compelled to quote in the same page from Archbishop Whately and the "Advertiser," the disgracefully-known "pot-house" paper of the London publicans. Controversy, like poverty, accustoms men to strange bed-fellows; but as it is the first time we ever happened to meet lawn-sleeves and the "licensed victuallers" in the same line of attack, it is well to anticipate what new judges of theological questions we may expect from this novel combination of "authorities." The collection of miscalled "Episcopal protests," stamped with a mitre on the cover, was insolent and false

enough; but, happily, these things do good in a way which their projectors little imagine, though we are content to see in them His hand over-ruling even malice and lies to the cause of Catholic truth.*

"The Exclusive Claims of Puseyite Episcopalians to the Christian Ministry, &c. in a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. Pusey," by John Brown, D.D. Minister of Langton, &c. (Edinburgh, Bell and Bradfute, 1842.) This is the work of a presbyterian minister, who certainly gives proofs of more learning than is usual in the community to which he belongs; but who, after all, is too ignorant to be qualified for the discussion he has undertaken. He ludicrously misconceives some of the most important elements of the question; and after the fashion of many others on his side, fancies he is startling and annihilating us with objections to which we have long been used, for which we are fully prepared, and which we can dispose of in an instant. We may, perhaps, take occasion to show this more fully hereafter.

Mr. Burns' "Periodicals" not only retain their attractiveness, but increase in interest. Our readers may imagine that these magazines—we are alluding to the "Englishman's," and that "for the Young"—are easy things to continue: let them be assured, that they require capacities of a peculiar and rare character. It is not cleverness, so much as heart, that is required to keep them up: and one is of much less frequent occurrence than the other.

* The following Americanism may serve as a set-off against some of the profanities which we are in the habit of receiving from the same source. It strikes us as being a *bijou*. It came to us *via* Canada.

COUNTRY CONVERSATIONS. (From the Banner of the Cross.)

"I. THAT ALTERS THE CASE."

Snuffle.—What horrid things those "Oxford Tracts" must be!

Steady.—Why, what now?

Snuffle.—Did not that poor Mr. Sibthorp keep on writing them till he had, at last, to go to Rome?

Steady.—Not at all. Mr. Sibthorp never wrote any of the "Oxford Tracts;" nor had any thing to do with them, or with their writers. But he *was* secretary of the "Religious Tract Society; perhaps it is that you are thinking of!

Snuffle.—Well, perhaps it is. There was something about "Tracts," I know.

"II. BLOWING HOT AND COLD."

Smith.—What can be the reason that Church people never have any prayer-meetings?

Jones.—Oh, *they* have no religion. Mere outside Christians!

Johnson.—What is that everlasting church-bell ringing again for? Every day this week, jingle, jingle, jingle! I am tired of hearing it.

Jackson.—Oh, I suppose it is for prayers: some "holiday," or other! They are always at it. Sheer Papists!

"III. THEM TRACTS."

Parishioner.—So you are really going to England!

Parson.—Yes, I sail, God willing, next week.

Parishioner.—What places do you expect to visit?

Parson.—I shall hope to see the principal towns; London and Oxford, and Cambridge especially.

Parishioner.—Oxford! That's where that wicked old man lives, that writes them Tracts, is it not?

"IV. WHY AND BECAUSE."

Churchman. What is the reason that your ministers never say the Apostles' Creed in your public worship?

Other Denomination-cr. Why, because it is not in the Bible.

Churchman.—Well, what is the reason that they scarcely ever say the Lord's Prayer?

Other Denomination-cr.—Well, I do not know. Perhaps, because it is.

We quite forget whether we have already called attention to Dr. Hook's admirable sermon, "The Peril of Idolatry;" at any rate, we know few single sermons which better deserve a second announcement, or a second reading.

Mr. Bandinel, of the Foreign Office, has published an official "Account of the Trade in Slaves from Africa," (Longman,) in a costly form. From the sources to which he has had access for information, a valuable work is the result; and it is the only one which contains the documents from which the history of this traffic, a work yet to be written, must be composed.

The reprint of "A Sober Inquiry; or, Christ's Reign with his Saints a Thousand Years, modestly asserted from Scripture," (Darling, 1842,) is on a subject too awful to be passed over by a brief notice. Such speculations should be conducted with an especial reference to the stream of Catholic tradition, of which neither the anonymous inquirer, nor his editor, seem to have the slightest conception. As might be expected, "Antichrist" is identified with "Christ's vicar;" this is quietly assumed, not a line is expended on the proof: in a certain school it is a theological axiom. What absurdity it is to trumpet this little book as "reprinted, with an advertisement, by the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, &c."—said advertisement consisting of just sixteen lines, the pith of which is, that Mr. Bickersteth "has pleasure in its being reprinted, and for this purpose has agreed [for a consideration?] to the request of the publisher to prefix this advertisement." In Colburn and Bentley, this would be called a catch-penny puff; but in the "religious world," these things are, we suppose, viewed differently.

With "A Companion to the Baptismal Font," being "An Abridgment of a Treatise on Baptism," (Seeley,) also by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, we have little sympathy, as far as the line adopted by him in reference to the doctrinal controversy is concerned, though we desire to express our sense of the value of some of the practical reflections, of which, for the most part, the present volume consists. But we should hardly like to talk of Baptism as "this interesting ordinance."

Once more Mr. Bickersteth! he has "great pleasure in complying" with another request, to prefix a few introductory words to "Principalities and Powers in Heavenly Places," by Charlotte Elizabeth, (Seeley,) though we should have thought the lady strong enough and willing enough to walk without the Watton leading strings. The present is by far the best book that we have seen of this writer;—written, of course, with the same perverted taste in style, and the same absence of Church principles, which are her inseparable accidents; but we do not wish to enter into these points. It is far pleasanter to praise than to find fault. Marvellous ingenuity does Charlotte Elizabeth display in insulting her betters, by talking of "the masked battery against the truth of Christ's Gospel, opened at Oxford," &c. &c., as an evidence of "Satanic wrath and malignancy, after the manner of the papacy, that convicted child of the devil," &c. &c. Very bellicose all this: it reminds one of—

"Guns, drums, trumpets, blunderbuss and thunder."

On the subject of Rome, and whatever she imagines to bear upon it, however remotely, we hold this lady to be mad; making all due allowance for this idiosyncrasy, there is so much that is good in the present work, that, with this serious abatement, we can recommend it almost unconditionally.

Sound principles, nay Church principles,—but to draw a distinction were futile,—seem to be springing up in places where we thought the simoom dwelt. Mr. Knight, the publisher of the Useful Knowledge (so-called) Society's books, in his graceful "Life of Shakspeare," has a passage or two which we cannot forbear quoting. "Devotion lived amidst old ceremonies derived from a long

antiquity; it waited upon the seasons; it hallowed the seed-time and the harvest, and made the frosts cheerful. But the formalists [the Puritans] came, and required men to be devout without imagination; to have faith, rejecting tradition and authority, and all the genial impulses of love and reverence associated with the visible world."—P. 72. "Long may our grammar schools be preserved amongst us in their integrity; not converted by the meddlings of innovation into lecture-rooms for cramming children with the nomenclature of every science; presenting little idea even of the physical world beyond that of its being a vast aggregation of objects that may be classified and catalogued; and leaving the spiritual world utterly uncared for, as a region whose products cannot be readily estimated by a money value."—P. 51. "Chaos and sable-vested night" may tremble in their inmost cells. Babbage and Brougham may shake on their thrones, when words so healthful and so true are uttered in their very adyta! Of Mr. Knight, apart from the system of which the books, which bear his name as a publisher, are the exponents, we desire to speak very respectfully; his Shakspeare is by far the best edition which has appeared.

Deering's "Sketches of Human Life," (Rivington,) is a gossiping collection of light essays; and strikes us as being a very odd book to have "Prebendary of St. Paul's and Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty" as the author's description. We cannot give a very clear notion of it.

We have elsewhere alluded to the Bishop of Down and Connor's Charge. Combined with one which his lordship delivered to the Clergy of Dromore,—("of the measure by which this [the union of the sees of Down and Dromore] and other unions, were effected, I shall say no more than that I offer to Almighty God my humble and hearty thanks, that I, as well as the general episcopate of the Irish Church, did not consent, but offered such resistance as we might to its accomplishment," p. 36),—it is published in a cheap and accessible form. These valuable papers deserve, what they will receive, an extensive circulation. Guarding the Churchman against Romanism and Puritanism, as this document does, it will be no surprise, to all who know the honesty of certain parties, to hear that the Record prints just half of it, *which half* we are not required to say.

"Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland, in 1839," (Edinburgh, White; London, Nisbet, 1842,) seems full of lively narration and interesting matter. It is not, of course, to be expected, that Missionaries from the *soi-disant* Church of Scotland should write so as to satisfy the *Christian Remembrancer*. Indeed, our present authors frequently seem to us to give indications of Judaism themselves. However, they seem good men of their kind, and not to have been too intent on the main object of their mission to hinder them from observing much that was interesting besides. What follows is amusing enough. "In walking through the streets (of Syria) it was interesting to find the language of ancient Greece moulded to express modern inventions. There was the 'Βασιλικον δρομειον Συρας,' i. e. the Royal Post-office of Syria; and, again, this title on a board, marking the sailing of the steamers, 'Ατμο ταχυπλοια.' We came upon three booksellers' shops, in one of which we found—'Τα θαυμασια συμβαντα του Ροβινσωνος Κρουσον,'—The wonderful Adventures of Robinson Crusoe.—'Ο πολυμαθης Χαλμερος και Ταυλορος,'—The learned Chalmers and Taylor." We subjoin a note in the part of the book which treats of the Holy Land, possessing grave interest:—

"A traveller once asserted to a Syrian shepherd, that the sheep knew the *dress* of their master, not his *voice*. The shepherd, on the other hand, asserted, it was the *voice* they knew. To settle the point, he and the traveller changed dresses, and went among the sheep. The traveller, in the shepherd's dress, called on the sheep, and tried to lead them; but they 'knew not his voice' and never moved. On the other hand, they ran at once at the call of their owner, though thus disguised."

We observe, that Mr. Alison has given to the world the concluding volume of his "*History of the French Revolution*," (Blackwood, Edinburgh; Cadell, London, 1842.)

For those who are interested in the Scottish Universities, we recommend "*A Memoir of the late James Halley, A.B.*" (Edinburgh, Johnstone, 1842,) on which we have just lighted. It is written, indeed, in a vein of Presbyterianism with which we cannot sympathize, and contains personalities against the living in the worst possible taste; but still the character and attainments of its subject give it a charm which it never otherwise could have.

The Rev. W. Goode has addressed a letter to the Bishop of Oxford, on "*Some Difficulties*" in his Lordship's recent Charge. Mr. Goode's learning and talents are such as must command respect; but in the present case we have "*some difficulties*" as to what he is attacking,—whether Church principles, or ritual novelties, or startling concessions to Romanism. It is quite the fashion of newspaper controversialists to mix all these things together; but surely a writer like Mr. Goode should let us know which and what he means, in regard to matters so perfectly distinct.

Three Visitation Sermons, preached in the diocese of Exeter, one by Dr. Cornish, at Honiton, another by Mr. Barnes, in the Cathedral, are in tone and execution worthy of the occasion, of the Bishop, and of the diocese. Higher praise we cannot give.

By some accident, the last (23d) volume of the "*Englishman's Library*" has come to hand almost as we were going to press: we can therefore only announce it as "*Selected Letters, edited by the Rev. T. Chamberlain.*" The idea is a happy one. On opening it, our eyes fell upon a letter of Niebuhr, published originally in Mr. Maurice's *Educational Magazine*. To persons engaged in literary pursuits, it conveys weighty advice. We might all profit by it.

We announce a most beautiful manual of devotion, "*Horology*," with initials, "*J. K.*," which alone will be its best recommendation. It consists partly of extracts from Bishop Andrews. The typography is beyond praise.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[*The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed in this department.*]

THOUGHTS ON THE TIMES.

It is our painful duty to call attention to another scandalous production, which has recently been circulated in a most offensive manner by certain members of the *low* or *no* Church party. We insert it not as though a magazine were the proper tribunal for dealing with such delinquents as Mr. Wilson, but just to inquire if there be no Clergy in the diocese of Chester of sufficient orthodoxy to make an appeal to the Bishop, in vindication of so vital a doctrine as that of "*baptismal regeneration?*" Is it to be tolerated that a Clergyman of

the Church should denounce it as a "Popish superstition?" Where, we ask, is the Bishop? Where is the Ecclesiastical Court?

"Thoughts on the Times. By the Rev. WILLIAM CARUS WILSON, M.A., Rector of Whittington."

"And what shall we say? Will any one deny that Popery is making a grand effort at this moment? Blessed be God, we know the eventual doom of the man of sin; but still he may die with a hard struggle, and I believe we witness it.

"Look at the chapels increasing in all directions! Look at the working of the Jesuits, and of the Sisters of Charity! And oh that here we could drop the pen!

"But truth compels us to direct our eye within the pale of our own Church, and to admit that even there the spirit of Popery is at work. If there ever was a time when it behoves all to be on their watch-towers, it is now; and the responsibility of those who venture to administer to the religious guidance and direction of others will be ill discharged, if they do not lift up the voice of warning, and speak out boldly against the errors that prevail. Sentiments have for some time been maintained and preached, which plainly lay the foundation for any Popish superstition that men can wish to establish.

"BAPTISMAL REGENERATION is one: the attaching an undue importance to the outward sign, and taking it for granted that all baptized persons are, as a matter of course, made partakers of a new and divine nature, so that to preach conversion to the baptized, is considered as unscriptural.

"RESERVE IN DECLARING THE GRAND DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH IN CHRIST, is another.

"Our blessed Reformers deemed this the turning point with a standing or falling Church; and so it is. If I forget thee, O my Saviour, as the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, in all that is precious to my own soul, and in all that I have to preach to my fellow-sinners, let my right hand forget her cunning. Never, never, may I determine to know any thing in my public ministrations, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified! Never, never, may I be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation!

"Another prevailing mischief, is THE SPIRIT OF EXCLUSIVENESS, [which says:] That salvation is, to say the least, very doubtful out of the pale of our own Church. I know the Clergyman who emptied his church by the constant enforcement of his authority on the ground of apostolical succession, and the abandonment of all dissenters to the uncovenanted mercies of God. I know another young Clergyman who told a gentleman, that his servant had better throw herself into the mouth of hell than enter a Methodist meeting-house. And another Clergyman might be named who keeps his surplice in his bedroom, and never ventures to say his private prayers except when wearing it.

"Now all this, and much more which might be stated, goes upon thoroughly unsound and dangerous principles of Church importance. I will yield to no one in attachment to that Church to which I belong: every year convinces me, more and more, of its superior excellence. I trust that no reader will be ready to reflect on our Church because of the follies, and worse than follies, of her false members. But I am satisfied that the most devoted attachment to the Church of England requires not that we should go such outrageous lengths, as to make the Church the judge of Scripture truth, rather than Scriptural truth the test of the Church's excellence.

"I DEFY ANY ONE TO PROVE, CLEARLY, AN UNBROKEN LINE, FROM THE APOSTLES TO THE CLERGY OF OUR CHURCH. But, supposing it can be proved ever so satisfactorily, I maintain that the Clergy have no ground for self-importance because of such a discovery. If apostolical spirit be wanting, what avails

apostolical succession? The Churches of Asia can fully trace their pedigree; but what avails such a distinction, amidst all the wretched ignorance, superstition, and ungodliness under which they are lying?

"I am no advocate for dissent; but what would have become of our increased population, amidst the neglect of our Mother Church, if it had not been for the labours of dissenters? I could have wished that our Church had sent labourers to put in the sickle in the harvest; but in her failure to do so, souls are too precious, as well as the Saviour's glory in their conversion, to allow of any quarrelling with those who take the field when we desert it.

"It is not the Church which sanctions such exclusiveness. Her spirit is truly Catholic; that is, she disclaims that any are saved by virtue of the Church to which they belong; and she teaches us to pray that the good Spirit may guide and govern *all who profess and call themselves Christians*. There she recognises the Catholic or universal Church, not merely the members of her own communion.

"I love my Church, and, with growing years, I love her more and more; but never will I part with a thought in which that love merges, viz., that there is a universal Church of Christ throughout the world, consisting of the faithful; to build up and perfect which, all the enclosures of separate communion are respectively the instruments.

"BUT IN THE SYSTEM WE DEPLORE, THERE IS THE VERY ESSENCE OF POPEERY."—*Friendly Visitor*, Feb. 1842.

EMIGRATION TO AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SIR,—I WAS much gratified in a late Number of your valuable journal, to observe the useful hints thrown out, in relation to the Diocese of Illinois. Since which I have seen with painful interest in the "*British Magazine*," pp. 209, 212, the letter of a Clergyman there, pointing out the results of a want of due care towards Churchmen emigrating to that region. To that letter I beg leave to draw the attention of your readers, and to suggest a plan for benefiting poor emigrants, and preventing the recurrence of a neglect so fatal to the best interests of our fellow-Christians in the humbler walks of life. It appears that fertile lands in Illinois may be bought for about 5s. per acre, and that from the Christian zeal of Bishop Chase and his exemplary family, Churchmen settling there may expect the kindest regard for their welfare. Let me therefore suggest as a safe investment to the wealthy, the outlay of, say £10,000, in purchasing 40,000 acres of land near Jubilee College. This would enable 1,000 poor families to receive allotments of 40 acres each; and if sold to them at 10s. per acre, payable in 10 years, would refund to their benefactors their original outlay, with £10 per cent. interest. With common industry and tolerable success, they could not only support themselves comfortably in the interim, (especially those, who, in addition to a knowledge of farming, were able to earn something as tradesmen and mechanics,) but after repaying principal and interest on the terms proposed, would possess a comfortable independence; so rapid are the strides of that attractive region in wealth and population,—the

products of its rich soil finding ready sale through the great canals, connecting it with the sea-ports of Canada and the United States. An additional expenditure of £10 per head would enable them to reach *viâ* Liverpool and Philadelphia, their future home,—where, if provided with the credentials so justly recommended by the Correspondent of the "British Magazine," they would be sure of receiving from their Christian brethren there the hand of fellowship and a warm welcome, as the little band among whom they went sensibly feel the necessity of receiving additional strength to fortify their Zion against its enemies on the right hand and on the left.

Even supposing this money never to be repaid, how can the wealthy expend a similar sum with the prospect of effecting so great an amount of permanent good? To relieve the pressure of distress at home, and provide for so many worthy families the means of future comfort and independence, is surely an adequate return! But when we recollect that we are thus building up our own Church in the far West, making its deserts to blossom as the rose, and its solitary places to rejoice,—we cannot conceive any plan of missionary enterprise so full of promise, both to those sent, and to those of the sister country among whom they go. This duty acquires new importance when the fact is borne in mind, that a large portion of the population of that diocese are Britons by birth, speak our own language, and for whose eternal interests every English Christian ought surely to be deeply interested.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

C. C.

THE LATITUDINARIAN HERESY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SIR,—As the Vicar of Huddersfield denies the truth of the statement with which on a former occasion I troubled you, I think it due to myself to request you to publish the following Letter.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Perhaps it is scarcely necessary to confirm the facts which gave rise to your Letter on the Nestorian heresy, since the Vicar of Huddersfield, in his Reply, does not distinctly deny them, although he is anxious to make it appear that the point brought forward at the meeting was—not whether it be true or false to assert that the Virgin Mary is the mother of God,—but whether it be right or wrong to teach children so to speak of her. This, however, appears to me to have been an afterthought. No such impression could have been made on his mind by the speech to which allusion has been made. For he himself told me after the meeting, that, being dull of hearing, he could not catch what was spoken on the subject. He cannot, therefore, be any authority with regard to the purport of the words employed. Dr. Musgrave, also, the chairman, I observe, is careful to guard his statement of what occurred by the saving clause—'so far as met my ear.'

"Now I, on the other hand, most distinctly heard what was said: every word met my ear, so that my affirmation of the facts on which your Letter rests is *confident and explicit*. I may add also, that the majority of the Clergy who were present bear their united testimony to the fact, that the words spoken contained a direct assertion of the Nestorian heresy.

"The very words used by the speaker, when commenting on the Roman Catechism, were these:—'The Virgin Mary was not the mother of God, but only the mother of His human nature.* I have no misgiving whatever upon the subject. I give you these *as the very words spoken*. The question involved in them became a matter of discussion immediately after the meeting among the Clergy who were present. The majority of them denounced the statement as heretical, while others as earnestly defended and re-asserted it in the most unequivocal manner. *No doubt was hinted by either party* as to the fact, that the speaker had declared that the Virgin was not the mother of God. The only question which arose among us was, whether it were right or wrong to make such a declaration. It would be easy, however painful, to make the proof as to the matter of fact yet stronger. But it cannot be necessary. No ingenuity can explain it away.

"I read in sorrow, rather than in anger, the unkind and sarcastic remarks of your correspondent, on the part taken by myself in the proceedings. His powers of sarcasm are well known, but surely they are misapplied in ridiculing a sacred feeling, which, whether rightly or wrongly attributed to me, every true Christian must experience when he thinks his Saviour dishonoured. Mine was simply an appeal, arising out of the statements which have been alluded to, on the solemn duty of distinguishing more carefully between Catholic verity and Roman Catholic error; and not being aware that the words had not met the Archdeacon's ear, I expected, and so did several others, that before the meeting closed the offender would receive the rebuke he merited from some one from whom it would come with greater weight than from myself.

"The Vicar of Huddersfield is correct in saying, that the Oxford Tracts were not directly alluded to: we merely drew an inference from the nature of the extracts made from the Romish Catechism, that the speaker designed to attack those publications.† *I explained all this to the Vicar of Huddersfield, and fully accounted to him for all you had said upon the subject before he wrote his Letter.*

"I scarcely think that you can be justly charged with being officious in bringing forward a subject which has given rise to discussion in more towns than one, and in various clerical societies in the neighbourhood. I believe that it has been generally found, that the expressions to which I have referred, have been defended by those who are most violent in accusing the writers and supporters of the Oxford Tracts of heresy.

"I may be permitted to observe, that neither you nor I wish to accuse the latter parties of not holding the doctrine of our Lord's divinity. I have to-day met with the following sentence in Bishop Hall's Epistles (Epist. l.):—

"The foundation [of the faith] is overthrown in two ways. Either in flat

* The Vicar of Huddersfield is unable to find warrant for the use of the term, Mother of God in holy Scripture. I would therefore refer him to Luke i. 35; "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Now the Son of God is God. Elizabeth styles her, "*The mother of my Lord.*" Luke i. 43.

† [That the inference drawn by the Incumbent of St. Paul's was not so very improbable, may be shown from the following extract from the preface to a sermon, recently published by the very speaker who is now charged with the Nestorian heresy, with the express view of defending himself from another charge, brought by his churchwarden, of holding unsound doctrine concerning the ever Blessed Trinity: "I consider Tractarianism as a departure from the doctrine and discipline of the ancient Catholic Church, as a modern innovation; for 'from the beginning it was not so,'—no, nor even from the beginning of the nineteenth century. I do not place the writings of the Fathers on the same sacred platform with the Bible, nor substitute tradition for Scripture. I am no advocate of the doctrine of the necessary connexion of regeneration with baptism, &c."—Preface, p. 5, to a Sermon preached on Trinity Sunday, by the Vicar of Almondbury. Brook, Huddersfield, 1842.—ED. "CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.]

terms, when a main principle of the faith is absolutely denied; or, secondly, by consequent, when any opinion is maintained which, by just sequel, overturneth that principle which the defendant proposes to hold, yet so as he will not grant the necessity of that deduction.' So with us, we do not deny that the 'defendants' hold the truth that the Saviour is God, but they maintain an opinion whose just sequel overturns that truth, and, consequently, according to Bishop Hall, are to be withstood as overthrowing the foundation of the faith. Let their opinion extensively prevail, and logical minds, rationalizing, will come legitimately to a conclusion, from which they themselves shrink with horror.

"I am, my dear Sir,

"Yours, most sincerely,

"THE INCUMBENT OF ST. PAUL'S, HUDDERSFIELD."

Now, sir, you will bear in mind, that my main statement was this: that the Nestorian heresy was asserted; that he who asserted it was not rebuked by those who profess great zeal against heresy; and that by latitudinarians generally it was defended. And by a competent witness, a Clergyman in whose praise it would be impertinent in me to speak, this statement is confirmed. Other Clergymen are ready to bear their testimony to the same effect. At the same time it appears that I was in error when I stated that the Oxford Tracts were attacked. But that I deserve no severity of censure on that account, appears from this; that having made the statement according to general report, I submitted it to the chairman of the meeting. His answer has been published by the Vicar of Huddersfield; and while he denies that there was anything in the speaker's remarks, "*so far as met my ear*," that could fairly be construed as directly or indirectly asserting the Nestorian heresy, or denying that the Lord Jesus Christ is God," he states that much passed at the meeting which was irrelevant; and as he did not comment on the allusion in the paper submitted to him to the Oxford Tracts, it was natural to infer that the report was correct, and that this was among the irrelevant things. On this point, therefore, it did not seem necessary to make further inquiry; and I have only to express my regret that my original information was incorrect, and that the erroneous report so extensively, and without contradiction, prevailed. My subsequent inquiries were directed to the question, whether the Nestorian heresy was or was not asserted, the chairman having guarded his denial of it in the manner quoted above; a denial, which certainly acquits Archdeacon Musgrave of all blame, but which is no denial whatever of the fact. A chairman, wearied by the proceedings of a large meeting, and annoyed by the introduction of much irrelevant matter, is so apt to become inattentive until a direct appeal is made to the chair, that few persons will be surprised that something was said that did not meet his ear. That the chairman was not called upon to rebuke what he did not hear is readily admitted, but it is not so easy to understand how this "disposes of the gravamen of the charge." The charge is this, 1. That the Nestorian heresy was asserted; for proof of which, I refer to the letter of the Incumbent of St. Paul's; 2. That he who asserted the heresy was unrebuked, which the Vicar of Huddersfield admits; 3. That those of the Clergy who are zealous against the Oxford Tracts afterwards defended the Nestorian statement, which no one denies; and, 4. That

to assert the Nestorian heresy is to deny that the Lord Jesus Christ is God, which follows as a necessary consequence, if we merely adopt the terms of which the Vicar of Huddersfield approves: "There was a certain woman named Mary, of whom the Saviour of the world was born." Now the Saviour of the world is God; therefore that "certain woman named Mary" was the mother of God. But the speaker asserted, that the Blessed Virgin was not the mother of God; but if she was the mother of the Saviour of the world, and yet is not the mother of God, then it follows that the Saviour of the world is not, according to the speaker, what the Catholic Church believes, "God over all, blessed for ever."

I have to complain of the Vicar of Huddersfield that he misunderstands, and, in consequence, unintentionally misrepresents the points of difference between those whom he undertakes to defend and myself: one instance of this has been given already in the letter of the Incumbent of St. Paul's;—and I have now to inform him, that the question is *not*, as he would insinuate, whether the phrase "mother of God" should be commonly used; the question is *not* whether it is expedient or inexpedient to put it into the mouth of a child; the question is *not* whether a person cannot believe rightly the divinity of our Lord, unless he calls the Virgin Mary "mother of God, and teaches others to call her so;" the question is *not* even whether it be one of the things necessary to be believed by every member of the Church;—the simple question is this, whether a man is not guilty of heresy, when he ventures to *censure* this expression,—when he ventures, as in the present case, to declare that the blessed Virgin is *not* the mother of God.* This is the point which the Church to which we belong is to decide between us.

When he speaks of the Church "to which both a Catholic and myself belong," it is difficult to understand whether the Vicar of Huddersfield uses the word Church in the Catholic or in a sectarian sense. But, either way, the decision is against him. If he believes in "one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," I then refer him for the decision of that "one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church," to the third general Council of that Church, which was assembled at Ephesus, A.D. 434, by Theodosius the younger, "to determine the controversy raised by Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, which heresy declaimed against the term Theotokos, mother of God, which *had long been applied to her who was the mother of Him who is both God and man*; and taught that the Son of Man, and God the Word

* The Vicar of Huddersfield not only states, or rather insinuates, incorrectly, the points of difference between us, but so refers to a great authority, as to lead the reader to suppose that my opinions do not accord with one of the most eminent catholic divines of the Church of England. Let the reader first note what the Vicar says of Bishop Pearson, and he will be surprised indeed to find that Bishop Pearson writes on this subject thus:—"We must acknowledge that the Blessed Virgin was properly and truly the mother of our Saviour. And so is she frequently styled the mother of Jesus, and by Elizabeth particularly, *the mother of her Lord*; as also by general consent of the Church, (because he who was born of her was God,) the Deipara; which being a compound title begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into its parts by the Latins, and so the *Virgin was plainly named the mother of God*." Article III. He adds a long note on the subject occupying three pages, wherein the Vicar will find the term to have been adopted formally before the fifth century.

were different persons, connected only by a moral and apparent union, contrary to the Scripture, which declares that 'the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,' and that 'God purchased the Church with His own blood.'" The Vicar of Huddersfield will observe, that this is not my private judgment; it is the judgment of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church "to which we both belong."

If he takes a sectarian view of the Church, and regards it as a favoured sect, established by the State at the time of the Reformation, although I should entirely disagree with him, yet by him nothing will be gained; for the act of Parliament, passed in the reign of queen Elizabeth, to empower certain persons to try heretics in the Church of England, recognises as obligatory the decisions of the four first Councils.

I have now only to return to my original position, and to repeat that there are parties in the Church, who are continually predicating heresy of those who, in the controversies of the day, hold what are called High-Church views, although they cannot substantiate the charge by an appeal to any decision of the Church; and that these parties are found to tolerate, to palliate, and often to defend a real heresy, where the assertion of it seems to favour the side they take in existing controversies. For a proof of this assertion, I may refer to the conduct of latitudinarians generally, in the late contest at Oxford, with reference to the Regius Professor of Divinity; I refer to the manner in which Nestorianism is preached and vindicated in other places besides Huddersfield; and, with the Vicar's permission, I refer once more to the meeting at Huddersfield, where, if I was wrong in stating that the Oxford Tracts were directly attacked, I believe that I cannot be contradicted, when I say that Nestorianism was defended by those who are known to be most vehement opponents of what they are pleased to call the Oxford heresy; certainly it was defended by this party generally in those discussions to which the meeting at Huddersfield has given rise.

On the other hand, those who at all times would oppose a heresy condemned by the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, feel themselves bound peculiarly to oppose the progress of Nestorianism in the Church of England at the present time, for many reasons: 1. they are especially called upon to do so, because of our resumed intercourse with the Eastern Christians, among whom the Nestorians form an episcopal sect;—2. They are especially called upon to do so, because we are bound to oppose the Mariolatry, or worship of the Virgin, in the Church of Rome, and, in the opinion of many, we shall nullify our arguments against this evil practice, if by asserting what Romanists can prove on our own principles to be heresy, we deny to her the honour which is her due, and which, by implying the reason why we do worship Him, who condescended to be her Son, is in truth the strongest condemnation of the worship which is paid to her;—3. They are especially bound to oppose Nestorianism in these days, because we may trace the shocking familiarity with which our Saviour is addressed in some of the most popular hymns, to the fact that men have been accustomed to regard our Lord's human nature apart from and unconnected with His divine nature, with which it is inseparably united;—

4. They are bound by the most sacred obligations to oppose Nestorianism, because to deny that the Blessed Virgin is the mother of God, is indirectly to deny that the Saviour of the world is God.

The personal allusions of the Vicar of Huddersfield I leave unnoticed. I do not enter into explanations which might amuse, but could not instruct your readers. I do not put to them, rhetorically, questions, which might insinuate charges against my correspondent, for this would answer no purpose but to wound his feelings, and belie my conviction, that he has written not under the impulse of "the old man," but from a pure zeal for the truth. I am unwilling to draw off attention from my main point, which is, that we may affix to latitudinarianism the stigma of heresy, while no consistent latitudinarian, on his own principle of "the Bible and the Bible only," has a right to predicate heresy of any system, sect, or party.

I have only, in conclusion, to add, that I entertain for my present correspondent feelings only of respect, and that I have endeavoured to answer his Letter in a manner consistent with those feelings.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A CATHOLIC.

[As the facts connected with what took place at Huddersfield, and the proceedings of our present correspondent in consequence, seem now sufficiently plain, surely all persons must allow that he has done nothing which it was not sufficiently open to him to do. And as a Catholic and the Vicar of Huddersfield seem equally free from Nestorianism (for the latter expressly admits the value of the phrase in question as a bulwark against that heresy,) there seems no further ground of controversy between them. We may be pardoned, therefore, for expressing a hope that the question may now drop.—ED. "CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER."]

POOR-LAW PRINCIPLES.

To the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,
the Petition of ———, of ——— Barrister at Law, and ———, Lec-
turer in Law,

Humbly sheweth:—

That your petitioner has, for several years, been devoted to the study of law, and the laws of England; and has particularly inquired into the principles of the legal provision for the Poor and the history of the English Poor-Laws.

That the great natural, moral, and religious duty of charity is binding upon nations, and legislators, and governments, as well as upon individuals; and that in every large community, especially in populous and commercial states, there will always arise such indigence and destitution, as private charity has ever proved inadequate to relieve; whence numbers must perish for want, where there is no legal provision for the poor.

That it is a modern error to suppose that there is no charity in such provision. It is the charity, not of the rate-payers or administrators of the law, but of the government, the legislature, the nation; not to supersede private charity, but only to supply its defect.

That the legal provision for the poor is also based upon natural and civil justice: the right of property seeming naturally limited by the right of earning a subsistence by lawful labour (no one in a civilized state possessing the latter right against any other individual in particular, but only against

the community or the state); and the state, while exacting obedience from all within its limits, owing protection, including the means of subsistence, to all in return,—a principle recognised by Sir W. Blackstone as the basis of our English Poor-laws,* and broadly stated by Montesquieu in his celebrated work on the Spirit of Laws.†

That the legal provision for the poor is further based upon political expediency; as necessary for the effectual prohibition of vagrant beggary; to prevent extreme want and starvation, the temptation and pretext for crime, thus tending to secure persons and property; to place those who, by circumstances, are less orderly, under the eye and control of their superiors and the law; as a bond of union between rich and poor, when rightly understood and administered; as a bond also for attaching the poor man to his country and its laws; as a useful and most legitimate corrective of extreme inequality of fortunes, which must always arise, especially in countries which enjoy most liberty and commerce; also as providing for the health and strength of the existing population; and because whatever is charitable and just is also expedient.

That it is neither charitable, just, nor expedient that the able-bodied poor should be maintained in idleness; but only that every poor person, in exchange for labour according to his ability, should be supported, when unable to support himself, at the common expense; without any degradation not necessarily attaching to the pauper's condition; and receiving relief not to be measured by the arbitrary and fluctuating condition of the independent labourer, which will naturally rise higher; but simply including whatever may be necessary to maintain him in health and strength, public policy allowing no more.

That after attentively and dispassionately considering all the arguments of Malthus and other opponents of the legal provision, your Petitioner is fully convinced that they are utterly fallacious and most pernicious; although he would not charge any of them with a deliberate want of charity, and is aware that such arguments have been adopted by many talented and also benevolent individuals.

That, to the great glory of the English nation, it has ever provided for the poor; it having been ordained from time immemorial, and incorporated into the Common Law, that the poor should be sustained by the Parsons, Rectors of Churches, and their parishioners; so that no one should die for default of sustenance;‡ the Churchwardens thus becoming the Common Law Overseers of the Poor.§

That the poor appear to have been formerly maintained out of the Rector's tithe, and offerings or contributions of the parishioners; and thus when benefices became appropriated, it was enacted that the appropriators should distribute yearly a convenient sum out of the profits to the poor parishioners of the same churches, in aid of their living; and that Vicars should be sufficiently endowed.||

That the monasteries, appropriating the churches, undertook the relief of the poor; and that "their hospitality was beyond compare,"¶ but being indiscriminate, encouraged idleness and beggary.

That, on their dissolution, new provision for the poor became necessary; whence, at the time when the smaller monasteries were dissolved,** an Act was passed to encourage voluntary charity, for relieving the impotent and keeping sturdy vagabonds at work;†† and the Act for dissolving the greater monasteries provided that the grantees of the dissolved houses should keep up "honest and continual household;"‡‡ but their hospitality, in the words of Fuller, was often confined to a shepherd and his dog.

* 1 Comm. 131.

† De l'Esprit des Loix, XXIII. c. 29.

‡ Mirror, c. 1, § 3.

§ Prideaux, c. 3.

|| 15 Ric. II. c. 6.

¶ Fuller.

** 27 Hen. VIII. c. 28.

†† 27 Hen. VIII. c. 25.

‡‡ 31 Hen. VIII. c. 18.

That the legislature then tried to provide for the poor by voluntary charity through the Church, but without restoring to the parochial Clergy their tithes and lands now taken from the monasteries; from which, or other causes, all the "gentle askings" of collectors of alms, the exhortations of ministers and churchwardens, and the "charitable ways and means" of the Bishop, appear to have proved abortive. Voluntary charity would not flow at the bidding of the temporal law; and every penalty failed to restrain beggary, for there was no sufficient provision for the poor.*

That on the petition of Sir Richard Gresham,† the father of Sir Thomas Gresham, the four City Hospitals were granted to the City for the benefit of their poor, by Henry VIII.; and that the pious young King Edward VI., instigated by the preaching of Lever and Bishop Ridley, anxiously sought to provide more effectually for the relief of the poor throughout the realm; by the Bishop's advice, beginning with London, where an excellent classification and provision for the poor was accordingly established, just before his death.‡

That in the happy and glorious reign of Queen Elizabeth, the legislature made some atonement for the sacrilege committed by its predecessors, in compelling the relief of the poor by their parishes;§ a system gradually matured, and almost perfected, by the 43 Eliz. c. 2, the celebrated basis of our old Poor-laws; separate Acts providing for the punishment of vagrant mendicity,|| for the encouragement of private charities,¶ and for their right administration.**

That by this most wise and charitable law of Elizabeth, for the relief of the poor, every inhabitant and occupier became chargeable in proportion to his property within the parish, and according to its ability, towards the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind, and such others *among them* being poor and unable to work (including, if thought proper, the erection of almshouses for their habitation); also for setting to work and apprenticing poor children; and for providing stocks of raw materials to set the poor on work; the collection and distribution of the funds being intrusted to the churchwardens, and other substantial householders, annually nominated overseers of the poor by two justices of the peace; and a general superintending authority being vested in such local magistrates.

That it is a modern error to suppose that relief was not provided for the able-bodied by this law, or that it is blameable for the mischiefs which have arisen from a complicated law of settlement, which has been subsequently introduced; the judges resolving upon the passing of the 39 Eliz. c. 3, from which this Act was copied, that "no man shall be put out of the town where he dwelleth, nor be sent to their place of birth (or last habitation), but a vagrant rogue, nor to be found by the town if they are able and *can get work, if they cannot, the Overseers must set them to labour*;" and such persons refusing to work at common wages, or neglecting the work assigned them by the Overseers, were to be sent, not to their place of birth or last dwelling for a year, but to the House of Correction.††

That your Petitioner, after considering all the subsequent changes in the law, is firmly of opinion that the mischiefs which prevailed previous to the Poor-Law Amendment Act, are almost wholly attributable to a departure from the just principles and simple provisions of the Elizabethan law, to a neglect of its fundamental principle of compelling the able-bodied to work, or to the necessity which, after the changes induced in a thousand years, seems to have arisen for a new and effectual distribution of parishes.

* See 27 Hen. VIII. c. 25; 1 Ed. VI. c. 3; 3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 16; and 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 2. † Burgon's Gresham, i. 26. ‡ Maitland, 937, 981, 1338.

§ 5 Eliz. c. 3; 14 Eliz. c. 5; 39 Eliz. c. 3; 43 Eliz. c. 2.

|| 39 Eliz. c. 4.

¶ 39 Eliz. c. 5.

** 43 Eliz. c. 4.

†† See 2 Inst. 730; Lambard's Eirenarcha; and Rex v. Collett, 2 B. & C. 324.

That the charitable principles of the Elizabethan law have been repeatedly affirmed and carried out by the legislature, especially during the war with France, a period of great glory and prosperity; but that of late years the false, contrary principles of Malthus have pervaded the nation, and reached the legislature itself, having been openly asserted by the principal promoters and supporters of the Poor-Law Amendment Act, which (as his biographer repeatedly boasts),* thus appears to have been based upon those principles; and being still frequently approved by the chief supporters and administrators of the new law.

That your Petitioner is aware that, under the new Poor-Law, however objectionable in details, the poor, including the able-bodied, are still entitled to relief, but that there is no security for its right administration until it is clearly based upon a right principle.

That the Act called Gilbert's Act,† was framed in a wise and very charitable spirit; to provide for the more efficient administration of relief and the better regulation of workhouses; to prevent the collection of the able-bodied poor in workhouses, the abuse eloquently denounced by Blackstone, and to remedy what, in Blackstone's opinion, was the only fault of the Elizabethan law, namely, the confining the management of the poor to small parochial districts:‡ Gilbert's Act may however have erred, in allowing the Guardians to contract for the employment of paupers for inadequate wages, making up the deficiency.

That your Petitioner fully believes that the law of Scotland *does* provide for the able-bodied poor, agreeably to the tenor of several statutes, and a decision of the Court of Session;§ but that such provision has been neglected, through the peculiar habits and circumstances of the Scotch; although the present state of Paisley proves the necessity for such provision.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays, that your Honourable House will not pass any Bill for continuing the Poor-Law Commission, without affirming the principle that it is right and expedient that the Poor should have relief in exchange for their labour, so that no one should die of want, and otherwise ameliorating that law as to your Honourable House may seem fit; that your Honourable House will not compel the dissolution of the Gilbert Unions until the new law has been ameliorated and perfected, but only remedy the defect of Gilbert's Act, if that should appear necessary; that, if, after a short further trial, the new Poor-Law should be still found defective, your Honourable House will then immediately take measures for recurring to the parochial system, including the effectual division, *to all intents and purposes*, of over-grown parishes, with the proper ecclesiastical sanction; and that your Honourable House will so amend or declare the law of Scotland, as to provide that every poor person, including the able-bodied, shall be entitled to relief in exchange for his or her labour, in Scotland as well as in England.

So may the blessings of the Poor ever attend your Honourable House; and your Petitioner will ever pray for its welfare.||

* See Memoirs of Malthus, prefixed to his "Principles of Political Economy," 1836. † 22 Geo. III. c. 83. ‡ 1 Comm. 361.

§ See Erskine's "Principles of the Law of Scotland," pp. 116, 117, (Note.)

|| The above petition was drawn up, to be presented on the 17th June, 1842, the day appointed for the second reading of the Poor-Law Continuance Bill; but withheld, on the consideration, that, as the petition of an individual (not complaining of personal grievance), it could not be expected to have any weight with the Legislature.

CONSECRATION OF THE FIVE NEW COLONIAL BISHOPS.

A PUBLIC Consecration of Bishops took place at Westminster Abbey, on Wednesday, the 24th of August, being the Festival of St. Bartholomew.

The Venerable THOMAS PARRY, D.D. late Archdeacon of Barbados, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, was consecrated Bishop of Barbados, in the room of the Right Rev. Bishop Coleridge, resigned.

The Venerable DANIEL GATEWARD DAVIS, D.D. of Pembroke College, Oxford, late Archdeacon of Antigua, was consecrated Bishop of the new Diocese of Antigua.

The Venerable WILLIAM PIERCY AUSTIN, D.D. of Exeter College, Oxford, late Archdeacon of British Guiana, was consecrated Bishop of the new Diocese of Guiana.

The Rev. GEORGE TOMLINSON, D.D. of St. John's College, Cambridge, late Minister of St. Matthew's Chapel, Spring Gardens, and one of the Secretaries of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, was consecrated Bishop of the new Diocese of Gibraltar, with jurisdiction over the Clergy of the English Church who are officiating in the Islands and on the shores of the Mediterranean sea.

The Rev. FRANCIS RUSSELL NIXON, Incumbent of Ash next Wingham, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, was consecrated Bishop of the new Diocese of Tasmania, including within its limits the Colony of Van Diemen's Land, and the adjacent Islands; all of which had previously formed part of the Diocese of Australia.

The Dioceses of Antigua and Guiana had previously been included within the Diocese of Barbados. These two Sees are endowed by a new disposition of the fund appropriated to the Diocese of Barbados, by the Act of 1824. The See of Gibraltar is entirely endowed from the fund placed at the disposal of the Archbishops and Bishops, for the Endowment of additional Colonial Bishoprics. The See of Tasmania is endowed partly from the same fund, and partly by a transfer to the Bishop of the provision hitherto made for the support of the Archdeacon of Van Diemen's Land; no one having been appointed to that archdeaconry since the death of the Venerable Archdeacon Hutchins, in 1841.

The consecration of so many bishops at one time, and the addition of four sees to those already erected in the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain, naturally excited much interest among the members of the Church; and a large number, both of the Clergy and the laity, gladly availed themselves of this first opportunity of joining in the public service on such an occasion.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, being prevented from attending by a sudden attack of illness, had appointed the Bishops of London, Winchester, Rochester, and Chichester, or any two of them, to act in his place, and to perform those parts of the service which are assigned to the Archbishop.

At the conclusion of morning prayer, the Bishop of London com-

menced the communion service, and was assisted by the Bishop of Rochester, who read the Epistle, and the Bishop of Winchester, who read the Gospel appointed for the day. The sermon was preached by the Right Rev. Bishop Coleridge, late Bishop of Barbados. The text was taken from Isaiah xliii. 5, 6—"Fear not, for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west: I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth." After the sermon, a voluntary was played, while the Bishops Elect retired to be vested in their rochets. On their return, each of them was presented to the presiding Bishops, by the Bishop of Chichester and Bishop Coleridge; the Queen's mandates for their consecration were read, and the Bishops took the oath of the Queen's supremacy, and the oaths of allegiance to the Queen and of obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The service then proceeded according to the appointed form, the Bishops Elect retiring to put on the rest of their episcopal robes, before the singing of the *Veni Creator Spiritus*. At the conclusion of the special service for the consecration, the holy communion was administered to as many of the congregation as remained. The alms given at the offertory, amounting to £114 4s. 6d., have been applied, by order of the Dean and Chapter, to the fund for the endowment of additional Colonial Bishoprics.

The most excellent arrangements had been made by the Dean and Chapter of the Abbey, and the whole ceremony proceeded in the most decorous manner.

The musical services were admirably selected: the exquisitely simple single chant of Tallis, the Kyrie Eleeson of Nares, and the *Veni Creator* by Attwood. This last was the more striking and affecting, being seldom heard; never, indeed, except upon such an occasion, and at the ordination of Priests. One advantage to be found in the performance of these offices in our cathedral churches is that the force and beauty of our services is thus fully shown. It is but just to those who took the principal parts in them, to say, that they were performed with equal taste and devotion; the alternate rising and falling of the notes of the organ, and the voices of the choristers, being admirably adapted to the expression of penitential supplication, or of praise and thanksgiving. The intervals occasioned by the change of dress required in those who were consecrated, were filled by voluntaries, excellently selected by the organist, Mr. Turle; and the attention and devout feeling thus duly maintained.

We can, perhaps, hardly hope to see again so many Bishops consecrated at one time; but it must be the earnest hope and prayer of every member of the Church, that this edifying ceremony may be repeated in public, and that (through the efforts now made for the increase of the fund for this especial purpose) many additional Bishops may be thus consecrated, and sent forth to the colonies; and that so the Churches may be established in the faith, and increase in number daily. Acts xvi. 5.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

By BP. OF BANGOR, July 24.

DEACON.

Of Oxford.—J. McIntosh, B.A. Ch. Ch. (i. d. St. Asaph.)

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—J. G. Jones, B.A. Jesus.

Of Dublin.—J. Evans, B.A. Trin.

By BP. OF CHESTER, at Durham, July 24.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—T. Goff, B.A. Oriel; T. Hugo, B.A. Worc.; J. Paul, B.A. Magd. Hall; C. C. Southey, B.A. Queen's.

Of Cambridge.—J. P. Firmin, B.A. Queen's; R. N. Featherstone, B.A. Jesus; D. H. Morice, B.A. Trin.; G. H. Stevens, B.A. Magd. Hall; R. C. Swan, B.A. St. John's; J. Yonge, B.A. Corp. Chris.

Of Dublin.—B. Arthur, B.A.; G. Barton, B.A.; G. G. Cashman, B.A.; J. Richardson, B.A.; H. G. Price, B.A.; W. Walter, M.A.; and J. C. Wood, B.A.

Of Durham.—W. Messenger, Univ. Of St. Bees.—J. H. Butcher, E. T. Clarke, J. Dalton, D. O. Etough, G. Lancaster, M. H. Maxwell, and J. M. Woodmason.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—G. H. Mc Gill, B.A. Bras.; T. C. Maule, B.A. Fell. St. John's; R. Powell, M.A. Worc.; D. D. Stewart, B.A. Exet.; J. B. Sweet, M.A. Hall; D. J. Yonge, B.A. New Inn H.

Of Cambridge.—T. S. Ackland, B.A. and W. Spencer, B.A. St. John's; H. G. Baily, B.A. and S. Moon, B.A. St. Cath. Hall; W. Haddon, B.A.; G. T. Kingdon, M.A., and C. H. Wilson, B.A., Trin.; D. S. Hodgson, B.A. Corp. Chris.; H. O. Irwin, B.A. Pemb.

Of Dublin.—A. W. Archer, B.A., G. Bamford, B.A., E. E. Carr, B.A., J. Cookson, B.A., W. M. Meara, M.A., J. Meredith, B.A., and W. Penfather, B.A.

Of Durham.—A. H. Hulton, B.A. Univ. Of St. Bees.—F. A. Bartlett, J. Litter, W. Sutcliffe, and J. Dawson.

By BP. OF NORWICH, July 24.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—T. H. Chase, B.A. Queen's; W. N. Lucas, B.A. Trin.; T. H. Mynors, B.A. Wad.; J. U. Robson, B.A. Magd. H.; G. Shand, B.A. Queen's; W. C. Ward, B.A. All Souls.

Of Cambridge.—A. Bellman, B.A. St. Peter's; J. H. Clubbe, B.A. St. John's; W. Collett, B.A. St. Peter's; G. Crabbe, B.A. Queen's; G. W. Darby, B.A. St. John's; G. Drury, B.A. Christ's; J. Fleming, B.A. St. John's; H. Golding, B.A. Trin.; H. Hall, B.A. Fell. of Magd.; A. Hamilton, B.A. Caius; J. F. Herschell, s.c.l. Queen's; T. G. P. Hough, B.A., and G. Jackson, B.A. Caius; C. W. Lohr, B.A. Corp. Chris.; H. P. Marsham, s.c.l. Trin. Hall; J. Postle, B.A. Corp. Chris.; A. Ramsay, B.A. Trin. (at the request of the Bishop of Chichester); M. S. Suckling, B.A. Trin.; R. Surtees, B.A. Corp. Chris.; J. A. William, B.A. Clare Hall.

PRIESTS.

Of Oxford.—W. C. Rawlinson, B.A. and W. H. Webb, M.A. Magd. H.

Of Cambridge.—J. Beckwith, B.A. Corp. Chris.; C. Blackden, B.A. Queen's; J. M. Brackenbury, M.A. St. John's; J. Chevallier, B.A. Caius; J. N. Cooper, B.A. Corp. Chris.; F. Daubeny, B.A. Jesus; C. J. Fisher, B.A. John's; R. Leggett, B.A. Caius; J. P. Royle, B.A. St. John's; J. P. Royle, B.A. Trin.; J. K. Tucker, B.A. St. Peter's; M. Turner, B.A. Emm.

Of the Ch. Mus. Coll.—S. C. Franklin.

By BP. OF RIPON, July 31.

DEACONS.

Of Oxford.—F. W. Vaux, B.A. Magd.; G. L. Waite, B.A. Univ.; J. C. Bradley, B.A. Queen's.

Of Cambridge.—W. Balderston, B.A. St. John's; J. Bickerdike, B.A. Trin.; J. Blackburn, B.A. and J. C. Chambers, B.A. St. John's; J. C. Chambers, B.A. Emm.; W. Clayton, B.A. Queen's (i. d. York).

Of Durham.—J. A. Whitehead, B.A.; J. T. Macintosh, B.A.

Of Dublin.—W. Kelly, B.A.

Of St. Bees.—C. Thompson.

Literates.—W. Chamier; E. Reddall.

PRIESTS.

Of Cambridge.—J. W. Irving, B.A. and E. Maxwell, M.A. Trin.; J. Harris, B.A. Cath. H.; H. L. Distin, B.A. Caius; T. Cheadle, B.A. Sid. Sus.

Of Durham.—Shunier, M.A. (i. d. York.)

Of St. Bees.—L. Roberts.

By BP. OF SODOR AND MAN, at Bishop's Court, Isle of Man, July 25.

PRIESTS.

W. Tait; T. F. Reed.

ORDINATIONS APPOINTED.

BP. OF LLANDAFF, Sept. 18.
BP. OF EXETER, Sept. 25.
BP. OF SALISBURY, Sept. 25.
BP. OF LINCOLN, Sept. 25.
BP. OF CARLISLE, Sept. 25.

NO. XXI.—N. S.

BP. OF PETERBOROUGH, Sept. 25.
BP. OF ELY, Nov. 27.
BP. OF WINCHESTER, Dec. 11.
BP. OF WORCESTER, Dec. 18.
BP. OF OXFORD, Dec. 18.

X X

PREFERMENTS.

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.	Val. Pop.
Allen, R.	{ St. Peter's, Ems- worth, p.c.	Sussex	Chichester		
Bearcroft, J.	Hadsor, n.	Worcester	Worcester	J. H. Gatten, Esq. ...	£254 100
Beavan, J.	Welford, v.	Northamp.	Peterboro'	Bishop of Oxford.....	*706 1011
Bird, E.	{ St. Thomas, Bir- mingham, n.	Warwick	Worcester	Trustees	560
Bowstead, T. S.	Tarvin, v.	Cheshire	Chester	*563 3415
Branker, P. W.	Meltham Mills, p.c. Yorksh.	Yorksh.	Ripon	Vicar of Almondbury.	
Brookfield, W. H.	{ St. Luke's, Bennett- street, p.c.	Middx.	London	Rev. G. Ward.	
Burt, J.	{ Hoe and Lethering- ham, p.c.	Suffolk	Norwich	Rev. — Reynolds	86 350
Casson, G.	Old, n.	Northamp.	Peterboro'	Bras. Coll. Oxf.....	*355 453
Chavasse, H.	Rushall, v.	Stafford	Lichfield	*292 693
Courtenay, R.	Thornton Watlass, n.	Yorksh.	Ripon	M. Millbank, Esq.....	475 448
Cox, J. E.	Southtown, p.c.	Suffolk	Norwich		
Cunditt, J.	{ St. Margaret's, Dur- ham, p.c.	Durham	Durham	Dean and Chapter	409
Deedes, G. F.	Netherbury, v.	Dorset	Sarum	{ Hon. and Rev. F. P. { Bouverie	*524 4910
Edgell, W. C.	{ Uggeshall cum So- therton.	Suffolk	Norwich	J. B. Blandy, Esq. ...	614 499
Edwards, E.	East Winch, v.	Norfolk	Norwich	Rev. G. E. Kent.....	*183 406
Field, E.	{ Reepham cum Ker- dison, n.	Norfolk	Norwich	Trin. Coll. Camb.....	*699 663
Frost, R.	{ St. Matbias, Man- chester, p.c.	Lanc.	Chester		
Gibbons, G.	Wilton, p.c.	Norfolk	Norwich		
Gifford, T. G.	{ St. Matthew's Chap- Spring-gardens	Middx.	London	Vicar of St. Martin's.	
Green, J.	Cammeringham, v.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Monson	140 134
Griffith, J. P.	Limington, p.c.	Somerset	B. & Wells	Wadh. Coll. Oxford...	*366 313
Harrison, J. G.	Queenboro', p.c.	Kent	Canterbury	Mayor & Corporation.	*66 600
Haughton, H. F.	Filmwell.	Sussex	Chichester	Bishop.	
Hayes, T.	Bracewell, v.	Yorksh.	Ripon	Earl de Grey	123 160
Henslowe, W. H.	Wormegay, p.c.	Norfolk	Norwich	Bishop of Norwich ...	40 339
Hobson, W. T.	Strelley, n.	Notts	Norwich	J. W. Edge, Esq.....	*90 426
Holmes, A.	Kirk Patrick, v.	Isle of Man		Bishop	122 2195
Ingham, T. B.	Rainhill, p.c.	Chester	Chester		
Jackson, J.	{ St. James, Hornsey, p.c.	Middx.	London		
James, D.	{ St. Thomas, Char- terhouse.	Middx.	London		
King, B.	{ St. George's-in-the- East.	Middx.	London	Bras. Coll. Oxford ...	*396 38,505
Knight, R. H. ...	Weston Favel.	Northamp.	Peterboro'	Own Petition	*236 443
Lillingstone, — ...	{ St. John's, South- end, p.c.	Kent	Rochester		
Lockwood, J. W. K.	Everingham, n.	York	York	Mrs. Martin	*237 276
Maskell, W.	Corscombe, n.	Dorset	Sarum	Own Petition	*514 714
Meade, E.	Winkfield, n.	Wilts	Sarum	*237 288
Meredith, C. J.	Combe, n.	Oxford	Oxford	Linc. Coll. Oxford ...	*90 619
Morgan, R. M.	St. John's, Swansea.	Glamorgan	St. David's		
Morris, G.	St. Allen, v.	Cornwall	Exeter	Bishop	*174 637
Newman, J. S. ...	Hockliffe, n.	Beds	Ely	W. W. Prescott	*393 1206
Redwar, T.	{ St. Thomas, Chan- cery-lane.	Middx.	London		
Remington, R.	Quernmore, c.	Lancashire	Chester	Vicar of Lancaster.	
Rhodes, E. D.	{ Kennington Chapel, Bath	Somerset	B. & Wells		
Richardson, E.	Oxcomb, n.	Lincoln	Lincoln	B. Grant, Esq.....	*125 32
Shepherd, R.	{ St. Margaret, Stan- stead, p.c.	Herts	London	Mrs. Pratt.	
Smith, F.	Tarrant Rushton, n.	Wilts	Sarum	Sir J. W. Smith	*219 226
Snowden, J.	Ilkley, v.	York	Ripon	{ Trustees of E. Hart- { ley, Esq.}	126 1063
Sunderland, S.	Penistone, v.	York	Ripon	A. Bosville, Esq.....	*147 5201
Thompson, A.	Ashby cum Fenby,	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor.....	*310 179
Townsend, G. F.	Brantingham, v.	York	York	D. & C. of Durham...	176 468
Vaudrey, D.	Stepney, n.	Middx.	London	Brasen. Coll. Oxford...	*1190 51,023
Villiers, W.	Shenstone, v.	Stafford	Lichf.	Rev. J. Peel	488 1827
Wade, C. J.	Low, Gravenhurst.	Beds.	Ely	Lord Chancellor	243 77
Watson, J. W.	{ St. Mary, Preston, p.c.	Lanc.	Chester	130 4000

* * The Asterisk denotes a Residence House.

APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson	Mast. Drax Grammar School.	Laing, C.	{ Chap. to East India Comp. Bombay.
Bates, E. M.A.	Cur. Oxenden, Northampton.	Maxwell, M. H.	{ Domestic Chaplain to Earl of Stair.
Conally, J. C.	Chap. William & Mary Yacht Woolwich.	Millner, W.	{ Birstal, Surry, for licenses, &c. (Of Reuldingfield, Suffolk, Sur- rogate.
Cramer, J. A.	Professor of Modern History, Univ. Oxford.	Notly, C.	{
Davidson, J.	{ Mast. of St. John's Hospital, Barnard Castle.	Phillipotts, T.	{ Chap. to Bp. of Exeter.
Duthey, W.	Rural Dean, Oundle.	Richards, T. W.	{ Mathematical Master of Oun- dle Grammar School.
Fawcett, J.	Dom. Chap. Lord Dunsany.	Stede, J.	{ Dom. Chap. to Earl of Mac- clesfield.
Finch, B. S.	Dom. Chap. to Earl of Buchan.	Tait, A. C.	{ Head Mast. of Rugby School.
Hill, R. M.A.	Curate, Furthoe, Northampton.	Tyrwhitt, R. E.	{ Assist. Chap. to East India Company at Bombay.
Kirby, R.	{ Second Master of Felstead Grammar School.		

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Andros, J. Rec. Haroldston, Pembroke, 53.	Lenze, E. Rec. W. Tilbury, Essex, 68.
Baker, C., Vic. of Tilmaurton, Kent, 66.	Longmore, D. Erle Stoke, Wilts.
Blashfield, C. W., Rec. of Goitre, Monmouth, 84.	Lushington, W. H. Rec. of Eastling, Kent.
Bromfield, T. R. Vic. of Napton and Grand- brough, Warwick, 74.	Maddrell, H. V., Kirk Christ Lezayre, Isle of Man, 77.
Cane, E., at Birmingham.	Marychurch, W. T., Rec. Sudbourne, 40.
Commeline, T., Vic. of Claverdon, Warwick, 46.	Morgan, W., Vic. of Tollesbury, Essex, 71.
Corfield, T. V., Much Wenlock, Salop, 34.	Page, R. L., of Emman. College, Cambridge, 37.
Edgar, J., Rect. of Kirton, Suffolk, 81.	Perry, T., at Llandidrod, Wales, 29.
Fisher, T. N. Ferriby, Hull, 82.	Pocklington, H. S., Vic. of Stebbing, Essex, 39.
Gale, J., at Wilton, near Taunton, 74.	Rodd, E., Preb. of Exeter Cathedral, 75.
Goodenough, J. R. Godmaistone.	Tennant, R. J., of Trin. Coll. Camb.
Gregg, T. H., in Jamaica, 58.	Trimmer, H., at Norwich, 43.
Hughes, J., Rec. of Lanvalter, Pemb. 74.	Watson, R., Rec. of Christ Church and St. Ewen, Bristol, 85.
Innes, G., Rec. of Hilperton, Wilts, 82.	Wells, J. R., Boxford, Berks, 72.
Jones, S., formerly of St. Helena, 62.	Wright, E. C., Rec. of Pitsford, Northampton.
Jones, J., St. Owens, Hereford, 58.	
Knight, R. H., Rec. of Weston Favel, 79.	

UNIVERSITIES.

OXFORD.

H. C. Onslow, M.A.; Rev. T. Bulter, M.A.;
Rev. E. K. Burney, M.A.; F. Freyman, B.A.,
Demes of Magdalen Coll.; and G. W. Paul,
B.A. of Wadham Coll. were elected and admitted
Probationary Fellows of Magdalen; and at the
same time, T. J. Prichard, (Schol. of Oriel),

J. G. Wenham, (Com. of St. John's,) G. Smith
(Com. of Christ Church,) W. W. Bradley, (Schol.
of Lincoln,) J. E. Millard, (Com. of Magd. H.)
R. H. Hill (Com. of Exeter,) and T. Kebble,
were elected and admitted Demies of Mag-
dalen.

CAMBRIDGE.

SELECT PREACHERS.

The following persons have been elected
afternoon preachers at Great St. Mary's, each
for the month to which his name is affixed:—

1842. October	The Hulsean Lecturer.
November ..	Rev. T. E. Hankinson, Corp.
December ..	Rev. R. C. Trench, Trin.
1843. January	Rev. C. Lawson, John's.
February	Rev. E. Steventon, Corp.
March	Rev. Prof. Robinson, Trin.
April	The Hulsean Lecturer.
May	Rev. J. W. Blakesley, Trin.

COMBINATION PAPER—1842.

PRIOR COMB.

Aug. 7.	Mr. Du Boulay, Clar.
14.	Mr. Gwilt, jun. Caius.
21.	Coll. Regal.
28.	Coll. Trin.

Sept. 4.	Coll. John.
11.	Mr. Butler, Magd.
18.	Mr. Tomkins, Cath.
25.	Mr. H. T. C. Hine, Corp.
Oct. 2.	Mr. Pratt, Cai.
9.	CONCITO AD CLERUM.
16.	Coll. Regal.
23.	Coll. Trin.
30.	COMMEN. BENEFACT.
Nov. 6.	Coll. John.
13.	Mr. Shorting, Pet.
20.	Mr. Smith, Pemb.
27.	Mr. Cathrow, Corp.
Dec. 4.	Mr. F. Jettard, Cai.
11.	Coll. Regal.
18.	Coll. Trin.
25.	Coll. John.

POSTER COMB.

Aug. 7.	Mr. Fowler, Trin.
14.	Mr. Garden, Trin.

- Aug. 21. Mr. E. F. Hankinson, Trin.
 24. FEST. S. BART. Mr. Ottley, Trin.
 28. Mr. J. W. North, Trin.
 Sept. 4. Mr. G. Wallace, Trin.
 11. Mr. Ball, Joh.
 18. Mr. Sculthorpe, John.
 21. FEST. S. MATT. Mr. Howard, Joh.
 25. Mr. Tomlinson, Joh.
 29. FEST. S. MICH. Mr. R. M. Ward, Joh.
 Oct. 2. Mr. W. G. Barker, Joh.
 9. Mr. Bury, Joh.
 16. Mr. Fellows, Joh.
 18. FEST. S. LUC. Mr. T. Hall, Joh.
 23. Mr. H. Snow, Joh.
 28. FEST. SS. SIM. ET JUD. Mr. C. Turner, Joh.
 30. Mr. Clutterbuck, Pet.
 Nov. 1. FEST. OM. SANCT. Mr. Peat, Pet.
 6. Mr. Wigram, Pet.
 13. Mr. Wix, Pet.
 20. Mr. Daniel, Pet.
 27. Mr. Garden, Pet.
 30. FEST. S. AND. Mr. T. T. Smith, Pet.
 Dec. 4. Mr. Myers, Clar.
 11. Mr. Bolton, Clar.
 18. Mr. Du Boulay, Clar.
 21. FEST. S. THOM. Mr. Begbie, Pemb.
 25. FEST. NATIV. Mr. Bourne, Cal.
 26. FEST. S. STEPH. Mr. Pratt, Cal.
 27. FEST. S. JOH. Mr. Daniel, Cal.
 28. FEST. INNOC. Mr. Gwilt, jun. Cal.

- RESP. IN JUR. CIV. OPPOS.
 Mr. Babbage, Trin. { Mr. Bates, Jes.
 { Mr. Fisher, Jes.
 RESP. IN MEDIC. OPPOS.
 Mr. Latham, Regal. { Mr. Potter, Regin.
 { Mr. Thackeray, Cal.
 RESP. IN THEOLOG. OPPOS.
 Mr. Reeve, Clar. { Mr. Cheere, Regin.
 { Mr. Hall, Clar.
 { Mr. Burnaby, Cal.
 { Coll. Regal.
 Mr. Ferrand, Trin. { Coll. Trin.
 { Coll. Joh.

- RESP. IN THEOLOG. OPPOS.
 Mr. Raymond, Trin. { Mr. Lowe, Chr.
 { Mr. Holland, Regin.
 { Mr. Jonas, Clar.
 Mr. Mason, Clar. { Mr. Kelly, jun. Cal.
 { Coll. Regal.
 { Coll. Trin.
 Mr. Armstrong, Joh. { Coll. Joh.
 { Mr. Staunton, Chr.
 { Mr. Heselrige, Reg.

KING'S COLLEGE.—Mr. James, the senior King's scholar upon the foundation of Eton at the election, 1842, has succeeded to a fellowship at King's College, which was rendered vacant by the resignation of the Rev. W. Elliot.

"TIMES" SCHOLARSHIPS.—At the recent distribution of prizes, at the City of London School, *The Times* scholarship, (first election,) value 30*l.* a-year, was adjudged to William Emery, who proceeds to this university. The English oration in praise of the founder, John Carpenter, was composed and delivered by Mr. Emery, who took occasion to refer to the establishment of the scholarship of which he is the first to reap the advantage.

At a Court of the Governors of Christ's Hospital, held on Tuesday, the result of the examination for *The Times* scholarship attached to that institution was announced, and the successful competitor appeared to be Wm. Romanis, the third in standing of the senior pupils, who will proceed to this university in October next, as the "First *Times* Scholar." The examination was both classical and mathematical (equal degrees of merit being assigned to proficiency in each study,) and continued three days; the Examiners being the Rev. W. A. Osborne, of Trinity College, late Craven University Scholar, senior classical medallist, &c., and now headmaster of Macclesfield school, and the Rev. B. W. Beatson, Fellow and Lecturer of Pembroke College.

DIOCESAN INTELLIGENCE.

CANTERBURY.—*Dover*.—We understand that the friends of the Rev. Mr. Seaton, who lost his election to the vicarage of St. Martin's, which lately took place in Dover, have purchased a site for the erection of a new church for him, adjoining St. Martin's church.

CHESTER.—The clergy of Chester, with the concurrence of the bishop of the diocese, have determined on the establishment of a school at Chester, in which 100 boys resident in the town shall receive instruction, which shall prepare them for admission to the universities, to the legal or medical profession, and to the army or navy.

EXETER.—*New Church at Barnstaple*.—A very interesting meeting was lately held at the Guildhall, Barnstaple, after the consecration of the new chapel at

Harracott, to make arrangements in aid of the new church proposed to be built in that parish, towards which desirable object the Rev. J. J. Scott had so munificently contributed. The presence of the Lord Bishop of this diocese materially aided the cause. The Mayor presided; and the Rev. Henry Luxmoore, Vicar of the parish, having moved a resolution, affirming the want of sufficient accommodation in the parish church, and the opinion of the meeting that the liberal offer of Mr. Scott should be accepted; the Bishop of Exeter in an admirable speech supported the resolution. The right rev. prelate took occasion to observe that he was struck with the painful appearance which the interior of Barnstaple church presented: that it was now a place of worship only for the renters of pews, and that the poor were practically excluded:—"Did they," said his Lordship, "imagine that it was honest thus to rob the poor of

this their first and highest privilege? He assured every one whom he addressed who was the owner of an appropriated pew in that church, that while it continued as it was, shut against the poor, he was guilty of robbery: that he had no more right to his appropriated pew, while the poor were without accommodation, than the poor had to claim and seize upon his own proper wealth. * * * He spoke especially to those who occupied appropriated pews; they owed a debt—they should do something considerable—their contribution should be more than a few pounds—more than the trifling sum which many of them expended often in the year in the pleasures of a day's entertainment. Here was a demand which as Christians and as honest men they were bound to meet and to satisfy." It is gratifying to hear a prelate, and that prelate the Bishop of Exeter, publicly avow these sentiments. His Lordship's appeal was worthily seconded; and subscriptions, amounting to above 1,100*l.* of the 2,000*l.* required, have been already announced.

LINCOLN.—A meeting of the Diocesan Board was held on Wednesday, the 10th, in the vestry-room of Lincoln Minster, at which it was agreed that it was expedient that a Prayer Chapel should be attached to the school, as in other collegiate institutions, which might also be rendered auxiliary to the carrying out more fully the intentions of the Board as regards the study and practice of ecclesiastical music. The funds for this desirable object, it is hoped, will soon be raised. The school is already in high repute in the county, having forty residents, besides numerous day scholars, all wearing the college cap. The Board is also taking steps for the training of masters.

LONDON.—The Lord Bishop of London has appointed the following days and places for holding his Visitations:—

October 10	} St. Paul's Cathedral.
" 11	
" 12	
" 13	} St. Alban's.
" 15	
" 17	} Bishop's Stortford.
" 18	
" 19	} Saffron Walden.
" 20	
" 21	} Dunmow.
" 22	
" 23	} Chelmsford.
" 24	
" 25	} Halstead.
" 26	
" 27	} Colchester.
" 28	

October 26 Maldon.
 " 27 Prittlewell.
 " 28 Brentwood.

The Temple Church.—We are informed that this splendid edifice, which will be open for divine service the first Sunday in November, is to be provided with a choice and numerous choir, including six boys, who will assist in the performance of "cathedral service;" the whole of the musical arrangements being under the control of Mr. Calvert, late of St. Paul's. The power and compass of the organ has been increased to that of St. Paul's, by Mr. Bishop, the builder, and we understand no expense will be spared to have the service performed in the best manner, avoiding, however, anything approaching to what is termed "display." (Formerly two female singers had to lead the psalmody.)

SALISBURY.—The Lord Bishop of Salisbury will hold his Triennial Visitation, for that part of his diocese which is situate in the county of Wilts, on the days and at the places undermentioned: viz.—Salisbury Cathedral, Tuesday, the 6th; Warminster, Wednesday, the 7th; Devizes, St. John, Thursday, the 8th; and at Marlborough, St. Peter, Friday, the 9th, days of September next, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon.

WORCESTER.—*Barnard's Green.*—A new church is to be built and endowed at Barnard's Green, in the parish of Great Malvern, Worcestershire, under circumstances of a very unusual character. The design has been originated by a few farmers and poor labourers, who form a population of 372 persons, resident from two to four miles from their parish church. The sum of 81*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* has been subscribed by these persons, in amounts varying from 6*d.* to 10*l.* 10*s.* Mr. Foley, the lord of the manor, has given them a site, and a subscription of 50*l.* The Lord Bishop of Worcester, the patron of the living, and the Vicar of Great Malvern, approve cordially of the design. The parishioners of Great Malvern have formed a committee to collect subscriptions. The total amount required is 1750*l.*

Church at the Wolverton Station, London and Birmingham Railway.—At a meeting of the Radcliffe trustees, held at Sir Robert Peel's house, Whitehall, it was proposed to appropriate 2,000*l.* out of the trust-funds, in part of a sum of 4,000*l.* which it was calculated would be sufficient

for building the intended church at Wolverton, the minister's house, and the wall surrounding the burying-ground, as soon as the Railway Company are prepared to lodge 2,000*l.* in the hands of a banker, as their portion thereof. In furtherance of the above object, the London and Birmingham Railway Company made, at their general meeting, a grant of 1,000*l.*; and although, in deference to the scruples of some of the Proprietors, about 50*l.* of this sum has been subsequently withdrawn, there remains 950*l.* of it applicable to the purpose of the grant. Private contributions to the amount of from 500*l.* to 600*l.* have come in further aid of it, and there is now about 1,500*l.* immediately applicable to the fund, being 500*l.* more than was originally expected for this object. The Company, in addition to the church-fund, have expended nearly 2,000*l.* in the erection of their schools, and reading-room for the men, which had since been provisionally used as a licensed chapel for the minister, appointed by the Bishop of Lincoln. They have also appropriated, as a present residence for the minister, one of their best houses at Wolverton, rent free, and they contribute 50*l.* per annum towards his stipend. The result of this expenditure has been most gratifying. The schools, which are under the immediate superintendence of the Rev. George Weight, the chaplain, are numerously attended, and are used not only by those from the resident families,

but also by children from the neighbouring parishes. The Directors have little doubt that it will shortly be in their power to announce that they have realized the amount required by the trustees towards the church-fund.

Kidderminster.—On Sunday week, notices were given in both our churches that the Holy Communion would in future be administered, in each, every Sunday in the year. This is no innovation, as some might ignorantly suppose, but is no more than the duty of every clergyman, who is bound faithfully to conform to the ordinances of the Church, as set forth in "The Book of Common Prayer and the administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England." There is much said in these days—we wish more was *thought*—of strictly adhering to the doctrines and practices of the *R*-formation; which, to speak more properly, is that period when our Church was restored to that Apostolical form which now she bears. At that time the Holy Communion was celebrated and devoutly received by numbers, not only in all cathedral and collegiate, but also in many parish churches, on every Sunday and holiday; and opportunity was given by the clergy, to those who might be willing to receive it.—*Ten Towns Messenger.*—(A well principled paper.)

WALES.

St. David's.—The Rural Deans of this diocese recently met the Bishop, by invitation, at the Palace, at Abergwilly, when it was unanimously resolved to revive the Church Union Society, formerly established by Bishop Burgess. Various resolutions were adopted in furtherance of the object of the meeting, and all present seemed to be animated with one common spirit to do all that in them lay to promote the interests of the Church. After the business of the day had been transacted, the Rural Deans had the honour of dining with his Lordship.

Among those present, we observed the Dean of St. David's, Archdeacons Davies and Venables, Dr. Ollivant, Dr. Humphreys, Dr. Hewson, the Rev. Messrs. De Winton, Bold, A. Brigstoke, W. Allen, J. Richardson, E. Morris, S. Philipps, W. Morgan, D. T. Thomas.

It is in contemplation to erect a new organ in the Cathedral, for which purpose the Lord Bishop of the diocese has munificently subscribed the sum of one hundred pounds, and the Dean and Chapter one hundred guineas.

FOREIGN.

MALTA.—*Endowment of the Bishopric of Gibraltar.*—At a public meeting of the British inhabitants, held 1st of July, 1842, in the city of Valetta, Malta, for the purpose of aiding the endowment of the Bishopric of Gibraltar, his Excellency the Governor, Lieut.-General Sir Henry F. Bouverie, G. C. M. G., K. C. B., in the chair,

the following statement was made by the chairman:—

"The object, importance, and propriety of this meeting will be best shown, by reading the resolutions of the Archbishops and Bishops of our Church at a public meeting held on the 27th of April, 1841, upon the summons of his Grace the

Archbishop of Canterbury, to take into consideration the best means of creating a fund to enable the sending out Bishops to our colonies, and the circular subsequently put forth by the sub-committee.

[These are already known to our readers.]

The following resolutions were then unanimously agreed to:—

1st. Moved by his Excellency the Governor, and seconded by the Right Hon. J. H. Frere;

"That the sentiments, wishes, and appeals, made in the Statement, cannot but deeply interest every one attached to the principles of our established Church, and that this meeting fully participates in the same.

"We have long been sensible of the injury our Church has sustained from the want of a Bishop to preside over its interests, and exercise those episcopal functions indispensable to the perfection of her order and discipline; and with whom the various British congregations in the Mediterranean might have ready and frequent intercourse.

"We therefore rejoice at the benefits about to be conferred on our apostolic Church in general, by the creation of new colonial bishoprics; but we are especially grateful, as in duty bound, for the exertions of our archbishops and bishops to promote the endowment of the Bishopric of Gibraltar.

"And as the principal place of residence of the Bishop will be the city of Valetta, where, also, the permanent British residents far exceed those of other colonies and settlements in the Mediterranean, and where our countrymen are now annually resorting in increasing numbers as visitors, the appeal to the sub-committee for the see of Gibraltar has the strongest claims on our attention and zealous cooperation, since the benefit of such appointment will be particularly felt at Malta."

2d. Moved and seconded as before;

"That application be made for subscriptions in aid of the fund required for the endowment of the see at Gibraltar; and that, to carry this resolution into effect, the following gentlemen belonging to the committee appointed by Her Majesty the Queen Dowager, for superintending the building of the Protestant Church of St. Paul's, viz.—Sir Hector Greig, Hon. Mr. Thornton, Rev. J. Cleugh, Rev. J. T. H. Le Mesurier, together with the gentlemen undernamed, S. Christian, Esq., Rev. E. Kitson, J. Napier, Esq., R. C. Sconce, Esq., be appointed by this meeting to act as a Committee, for the purpose of receiving and transmitting the sums

subscribed, and of endeavouring to collect further subscriptions, by submitting this important subject to the notice of strangers arriving at Malta; and of writing to request the cooperation of every community of the Church of England established around the shores of the Mediterranean within the diocese of Gibraltar."

3d. Moved by the Right Hon. J. H. Frere, and seconded by the Reverend J. Cleugh;

"That his Excellency Sir Henry Bouverie be requested to transmit to the Governor of Gibraltar, and to the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, a copy of these resolutions, with an expression of the confidence felt by this meeting that the British inhabitants in either place will readily cooperate in the exertions now making towards realizing the proposed endowment."

4th. Moved by the Right Hon. J. H. Frere, and seconded by Rear Admiral Sir John Louis, Bart.

"That the cordial thanks of this meeting are due, and are hereby respectfully offered, to his Excellency the Governor, for his kindness in presiding over, and conducting the proceedings of this day."

Between 800*l.* and 900*l.* have been already received.

MONTREAL.—We reprint from the *Toronto Church*, of 6th February, 1841, the regulations which the Bishop of Montreal issued with reference to a matter which has lately caused some animadversions at home:—

"We are requested to state that the following circular, since the date which it bears, has been referred home, and has received the approbation of high ecclesiastical authority in the mother country:—

"Marchmont, near Quebec,
"18th August, 1840.

"Rev. Sir,—The question having been more than once brought under my notice, whether it would not be proper to establish certain rules and restrictions in this diocese, relative to the admission of monuments within the walls of our churches, I have given the best consideration in my power to the subject; as the result of which I beg to signify to you my wish that the regulations which follow, should be adopted in this behalf:

"1. That no monument shall be put up within any church, the inscription prepared for which shall not have been first approved by the clergyman in charge upon the spot.

"2. That the privilege shall be con-

fined to the case of persons who are habitual communicants of the Church.

"3. That the fee to be received by the clergyman, (established with a view of restraining the undue and inconvenient multiplication of monuments,) shall vary according to the circumstances of the congregation, but in no case shall exceed 10*l.* for a mural tablet, or 90*l.* for a monument of whatever magnitude or design; and in no case shall be less than 2*l.* 10*s.*; all differences upon the subject being referable to the decision of the Bishop.

"The first of these rules must be made applicable in the case of tombstones and other memorials erected in *burial grounds* which are under the control of the Church of England.

"The second will in effect supersede the necessity of a rule which I have already intimated my desire to establish, respecting persons who have fallen victims to their compliance with the custom of duelling, it being presumed that no such persons will be found to have been numbered among our communicants.

"I am, Rev. Sir,

"Your faithful and affectionate Brother,
(Signed) "G. J. MONTREAL."

And from the same journal of 22d July, 1842, we extract—

"The following gratifying address, expressed with much force and dignity of feeling, was presented to the Bishop during the Visitation:—

"To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Montreal.

"May it please Your Lordship,—We, the undersigned Clergymen of the diocese

of Quebec, have read with feelings of deep concern the attacks made upon your Lordship in the Imperial Parliament, and elsewhere, on account of the course which you have deemed it incumbent upon you to pursue, with respect to the erection of monuments within the churches of the diocese.

"We appreciate your Lordship's motives; we honour your zeal for the glory of God; and we tender the assurance of our dutiful support to any measures which you may see fit to adopt, towards preserving inviolate the sanctity which be- seems a Christian temple.

"Montreal, 6th July, 1842.

"Signed by Wm. Dawes, M. Wil- loughby, James L. Alexander, George Mackie, W. King, Wm. Bonn, Richard Lonsdell, R. G. Ples, D. Falloon, Richard Anderson, Andrew Balfour, Henry D. Sewell, Wm. Thompson, P. J. Manning, Fred. Broome, Wm. Anderson, W. W. Wait, Jas. Ramsay, N. Guerout, D. Robertson, Samuel S. Wood, Charles Morice, Jas. Pyke, R. H. Bourne, Charles Morris, John Torrance, Robert Knight, John Bethune, C. P. Reid, Jas. Reid, R. R. Burrage, G. M. Ross, D. B. Barn- ther, W. Brethour, Jas. Jones, M. Town- send, John Butler, J. A. Allen, F. J. Lundy, E. W. Sewell, J. Taylor, Thos. Johnson, L. Doolittle, Joseph Abbott, John Macmaster, C. B. Fleming, John Johnston, C. Jackson."

"The discussion of this matter, instead of weakening, has served to strengthen the Church, and to root it more firmly in the respect of the community."

CHURCHES CONSECRATED.

St. James.....	Muswell Hill, Hornsey, Middlesex.....	Bishop of London.
St. Thomas.....	Bream's-bldgs, Chancery-lane, London...	Ditto.
St. Maurice & St. Mary...	Winchester.....	Bishop of Winchester.
St. Paul's.....	Rotherham, Yorkshire.....	Bishop of Ripon.
St. Paul's.....	Shadwell, Yorkshire.....	Ditto.
St. James the Less.....	Bethnal-green.....	Bishop of London.
	Harracott, Barnstable.....	Bishop of Exeter.
St. Nicholas.....	Hereford.....	Bishop of Hereford.
	Luton, Chatham.....	Bishop of Rochester.
St. Thomas.....	Charter-house.....	Bishop of London.
	Meckley, near Ripon.....	Bishop of Ripon.
	Portreath, Illogan, Cornwall.....	Bishop of Exeter.
	Camborne, Cornwall.....	Ditto.
St. Peter's.....	Flushing, Cornwall.....	Ditto.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We know not whether a "Priest of the English Church," who is perplexed about Baptismal Regeneration, writes with the wish of giving or asking advice. Any way, his letter betrays a gentle and earnest spirit. Might we suggest that he should read Bishop Bethell's book on Baptismal Regeneration—especially Chapter V.? It is one written long before our present disputes commenced, and on that account may prove to our correspondent more acceptable; but we speak from experience when we say that, in the case of all who hesitated about the doctrine, and who rested chiefly on 1 John v. 4, the Bishop's argument has been most convincing.

We will endeavour to take up the subject suggested by "E." in the course of two or three months.